NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

MICROCOPY
215
ROLL
32

NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

Microcopy No. 215

MINUTES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Roll 32

October 3, 1927 - June 3, 1929

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington: 1954

NOTES ON ROLL 32

The two volumes reproduced on this roll have the following backstrip titles: (1) "Minutes / 1927 / Supreme Court / of the / United States" and (2) "Minutes / 1928 / Supreme Court / of the / United States." They contain the minutes of the Supreme Court of the United States from October 3, 1927, to June 3, 1929.

The first volume contains the minutes of the Court from October 3, 1927, to June 5, 1928, and the second, from October 1, 1928, to June 3, 1929.

VOLUME

1927

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1927.

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present Seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 3rd day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and twenty-seven and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and fifty-second, The Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph A. Cantrel, It is ordered that Frank J. Albus, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and J. Edward Collum, Esquire, of Allentown, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan H. Beach, It is ordered that H. Rozier Dulany, Jr., of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. DeForest Manice, It is ordered that George Trosk, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thos. A. Billingsley, It is ordered that James E. Thomas and Herman F. Krickenberger, Esquires, of Greenville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. T. Hammock, It is ordered that P. A. Lasley, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell, It is ordered that Roy V. Reppy, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Morris W. Lieberman, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther M. Walter, It is ordered that A. Henry Walter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Wm. J. Koebel, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt, It is ordered that Chas. G. Middleton, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys, It is ordered that John M. Rankin and Herman E. Werner, Esquires, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Clifford, It is ordered that E. J. Verlie, Esquire, of Alton, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that P. W. Cress, Esquire of Perry, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace R. Lamb, It is ordered that Carl J. Austrian and Saul J. Lance, Esquires, of New York City, and Lowell White, Esqdire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Hugh L. Smith, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Julian S. Eaton, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Free, It is ordered that George Washington Waldorf, Esquire, of San Jose, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Hudgins, It is ordered that Lothrop Withington, Esquire, of Brookline, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Lees, It is ordered that J. Sydnor Bohannon, Esquire, of Waynesville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Arthur V. Roberts, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry D. Williams, It is ordered that Chester Rohrlich, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Arthur G. Stone, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Ira C. Oehler, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas M. Adams,

Appellant,

15 vs. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause, pursuant to a stipulation of counsel filed herein;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Delaware, Pennsylvania,
Plaintiff in error,
276 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation.
School District of Tinicum Township, Pennsylvania,
Plaintiff in error,
277 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The motion to dismiss these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Donald S. Edmonds, for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

The United States of America and
The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
293 vs.
The Kansas City Southern Railway
Company, et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellants, and by Mr. Samuel W. Moore and Mr. Frank H. Moore for the appellees.

The Pueblo of Santa Rosa,
Petitioner,
511, October Term, 1926.
vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of
Inferior, et al.

The motion to correct the mandate in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondents.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,

Petitioner,

219 vs.

The Colonial Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.

C. G. Lewellyn, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,

Petitioner,

220 vs.

The Colonial Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. James M. Beck in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of The Osage Indian Tribe as amicus curiae in this cause.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut,

Petitioner,

190 vs.

Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius, et al., Executors.

Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius, et al., Executors,

Plaintiffs in error,

191 vs.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes in that behalf.

F. H. Mason,

Petitioner,

152 vs.

C. F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Charles E. Hughes, Edward Cornell, William C. Breed, Paul Armitage, and Harrison Twee, as amici curiae in this cause.

John W. Blodgett,
154 vs.
Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John W. Davis in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of William C. Cannon as amicus curiae in this cause.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Appellant,
79 vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia, Birk S. Strathers, Ernest D. Lewis, et al.

On consideration of the motion to substitute I. Wade Coffman and C. E. Nethken, members of The Public Service Commission of West Virginia, in the place of Birk S. Strathers and Ernest D. Lewis, retired, as parties appellee herein, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, Appellant,
101 vs.
Middlesex Water Company.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Bergen for the appellee, in support of the motion.

Arthur Rich,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

The motion to postpone the submission of the petition for a writ of certiorari until the case is heard upon the writ of error, No. 543, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard S. Doyle in behalf of Mr. Harry Eugene Kelly and Mr. Thornton M. Pratt, for the petitioner.

Arthur Rich,
Plaintiff in error,
543 vs.
People of the State of Michigan.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, in behalf of Mr. Harry Eugene Kelly and Mr. Thornton M. Pratt, for the plaintiff in error.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knauth, Nachod & Kuhne,

Petitioner,

130 vs.

The First National Bank of Trinidad, Colorado.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Chester Rohrlich in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the Fidelity Trust Company of New York as amicus curiae in this cause.

J. W. Hampton, Jr., & Co.,

Petitioner,

242 vs.

The United States.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter E. Hampton for the petitioner.

State of Ohio, on relation of National Mutual Insurance Company,

Plaintiff in error,

430 vs.

William C. Safford, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.

State of Ohio, on relation of the Celina Mutual Casualty Company

Plaintiff in error,

431 vs.

William C. Safford, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Edward C. Turner and Mr. C. S. Younger for the defendants in error.

No. 1. Rhederei M. Jebsen Company, appellant, vs. The United States:

No. 2. The Firm of M. Jebsen, Corresponding Owner of the Steamship Company, Carl Diederichsen for the use of Rhederei M. Jebsen Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 3. Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 4. Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 5. Atlas Line Steamship Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 6. Atlas Line Steamship Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1927 - CONTINUED.

No. 7. North German Lloyd, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 8. North German Lloyd, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 9. North German Lloyd, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 10. Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft, (also known as Hamburg-American Line, appellant, vs. The United States.

Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft (also known as Hamburg-American Line),

Appellant,

11 vs.

The United States.

Deutsch-Australische Dampfschiffs-Gesellschaft,

Appellant,

12 vs.

The United States.

The motion to pass these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar W. Hunt, in behalf of the appellants in Nos. 3 to 12, inclusive, in support of the motion with the consent of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, and by Mr. J. J. Lynch for the appellants in Nos. 1 and 2, in opposition thereto, with leave to counsel for the appellants in Nos. 3 to 12, to file a brief within two days and to appellants in Nos. 1 and 2 to file a brief in opposition thereto within five days.

Manson R. Kevil, Receiver of the First National Bank of Carnegie,

Plaintiff in error,

172 vs.

Peter G. Cameron, Secretary of Banking of Pennsylvania, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. William S. Moorhead suggesting the death of Manson R. Kevil, Receiver of the First National Bank of Carnegie, party plaintiff in error in this cause; and he having moved the Court to substitute Lloyd Littrell, Receiver of the First National Bank of Carnegie, as the party plaintiff in error in this cause;

It isnow here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Nevada,

Complainant,

4, Original vs.

Crown Williamette Paper Company.

The stipulation to continue this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis W. Clements in that behalf.

St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company and St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,

Petitioners,

577, October Term 1926.

vs.

E. B. Spiller, et al.

The motion to retax the costs in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. S. Bailey in that behalf.

Interstate Busses Corporation,

Appellant,

197 vs.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Kelly for the appellant.

H. Plamals,

Petitioner,

225 vs.

The Steamship "Pinar Del Rio," her engines, boilers, etc.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Ellis, in behalf of Mr. S. B. Axtell, for the petitioner.

John W. Blodgett,

Petitioner,

154 vs.

Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Ira Jewell Williams, Nathan Glicksman, and Louis Quarles as amici curiae in this cause.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1927 - CONTINUED.

Edward E. Jenkins, as Receiver of the National City Bank of Salt Lake City, Petitioner,
424 vs.
National Surety Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. George P. Barse in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Joseph W. McIntosh, Comptroller of the Currency of the United States, as amicus curiae in this cause.

Curtis Friedlander,
Plaintiff in error,
574 vs.
State of Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

Mr. Blaine Mallan, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"Curtis Friedlander,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
State of Washington
Defendant in error,

No. 20,096
Certificate in support of Motion to Docket and Dismiss.

State of Washington,
County of Thurston. ss.

I, C. S. Reinhart, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, hereby certify that the plaintiff in error in the above entitled case was on January 6, 1926, adjudged guilty in the superior court of the state of Washington for Grays Harbor County of the crime of contributing to the delinquency of a female child of the age of sixteen years in violation of section 1987-17, Remington's Compiled Statutes of Washington, 1922; that said judgment of conviction was affirmed by the supreme court of the state of Washington on November 3, 1926 (40 Wash.Dec. 533); that rehearing en banc was denied by the said supreme court of Washington on December 18, 1926; that said plaintiff in error on December 21, 1926 filed with the supreme court of Washington his petition for a writ of error together with assignments of error and bond; that writ of error was duly allowed by Honorable Warren W. Tolman, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Washington, on December 21, 1926, and that citation upon said writ of error fixing the return date as of March 1, 1927 was thereupon issued.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said court this 6th day of September, 1927.

/s/ C. S. REINHART.
Clerk."

(S E A L)

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of the State of Washington to be proceeded in according to law and justice

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Lakewood Engineering Company and Edward G. Carr, Petitioners, vs. A. W. French & Co., Alfred W. French, Edwin A. Allen, et al., etc. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

200

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frank Dennett, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause, pursuant to a stipulation of counsel filed herein;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed, by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph J. Weinhandler, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On consideration of the motion to withdraw the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause, now on file, and to file a substituted petition therefor, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

481

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Verner, Sole Executor under the Will of Emily L. Moore, deceased, Petitioner,
222 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John W. Townsend in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Herbert Noble and Scott Scammell as amici curiae in this cause.

John W. Blodgett,
154 vs.
Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Josephine S. Goodwin as amicus curiae in this cause.

John W. Blodgett,
154 vs.
Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Hugh Obear in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Helen S. Schmidt as amicus curiae in this cause.

Elmira Holland, Plaintiff in error,
46 vs.
James S. Swilley.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. William L. Houston suggesting the death of Elmira Holland, party plaintiff in error in this cause; and he having moved the Court to substitute Thomas H. Dent, Administrator of the Estate of Elmira Holland, Deceased, as the party plaintiff in error in this cause; It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew P. Vought, Petitioner,
51 vs.
K. K. Kanne, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Andrew P. Vought, Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Wichita Board of Trade,
Plaintiff in error,
132 vs.
The Farmer's Co-operative Commission Company and A. E. Randall.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jessie L. Wickwire, individually, etc.,
Petitioner,
149 vs.
Mabel G. Reinecke, as Collector etc.

This cause was submitted on printed briefs, pursuant to 23d rule, by Mr. Forest D. Siefkin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

O. E. Harlin, Norta Harlin, and the American Investment Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
165 vs.
Mary Gage, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court, under Section 237-c of the Judicial Code as amended by Act of February 13, 1925, by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the petitioners.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1927 - CONTINUED.

James W. Bothwell, William J. Michel, et al., etc., Petitioners,
169 vs.
Buckbee, Mears Company.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed briefs pursuant to the twenty-third rule, by Mr. Morton Barrows and Mr. George P. Metcalf for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wm. H. Oppenheimer and Mr. Montreville J. Brown for the respondent.

B. S. Wheeler and M. S. Calasso, Plaintiffs in error
253 vs.
Galen D. Pue.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Lowndes Maury for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. James H. Baldwin for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
273 vs.
The State of Florida, ex rel. A. S. Wells, E. S. Mathews, et al., etc.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Pipe Line Company, Inc., et al., Plaintiffs in error,
319 vs.
Commissioners of Index Sulphur Drainage District, and T. B. Vance, Receiver of South Miller County Highway District.

Upon consideration of the stipulation of counsel filed herein; It is now here ordered by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed as to T. B. Vance, Receiver of South Miller County Highway District, one of the defendants in error in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Genna,
Petitioner,
347 vs.
State of Louisiana.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Adams for the petitioner.

Molton Brasseaux,
Petitioner,
351 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Molton Brasseaux, pro se.

Ex parte:
William Faltin,
Petitioner,
352.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Ray for the petitioner.

F. H. Fullwood,
Plaintiff in error,
370 vs.
City of Canton, Ohio, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Faber J. Drukenbrod for the plaintiff in error.

J. D. Austin,
Petitioner,
427 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Austin, pro se.

John B. Lemieux, Peter Lemieux, Maggie Martineau, et al.,
Petitioners,
549 vs.
Agate Land Company and City of Superior.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Arnold for the petitioners.

Nicola Sacco and Bartholomeo Vanzetti, Petitioners,
467 vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nicola Sacco and Bartholomeo Vanzetti, Petitioners,
468 vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioners to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Verner, Sole Executor under the Will of Emily L. Moore, deceased, Petitioner,
222 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John W. Townsend for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

John D. Chapman,

Petitioner,

232 vs.

The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sanford Robinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. J. Robert Anderson, and Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the respondent.

J. F. McMurray,

Petitioner,

236 vs.

The Choctaw Nation of Indians, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Hamilton, Mr. John F. McCarron, Mr. F. C. Dillard, Mr. Emmet E. McInnis, and Mr. Melvin Cornish for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George T. Stormont, Mr. Hampton Tucker, and Mr. G. G. McVay for the respondents.

The Choctaw Nation of Indians and the Chickasaw Nation of Indians,

Petitioners,

245 vs.

J. F. McMurray.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Hampton Tucker for the petitioners.

St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railway Company,

Petitioner,

237 vs.

Edna LaLone, Administratrix of the Estate of Maurice LaLone, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Howell for the petitioner, and by Mr. James T. Blair for the respondent.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis,
Petitioner,
238 vs.
James Swain.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Howell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark D. Eagleton for the respondent.

John Caruthers,
Petitioner,
239 vs.
Henry B. Hines and Cal T. Scott.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Watkins for the petitioner.

Apolinaria Solon,
Petitioner,
241 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gregory Cipriani for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Cattron Rigby for the respondents.

Detroit Steel Products Company,
Petitioner,
243 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Rembrandt H. Peale,
Petitioner,
244 vs.
Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, Hubert Work, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter for the respondents.

Katie Roberts Wilson,
Petitioner,
246 vs.
Margaret Jane Robinson, Jane Doe Robinson, John Doe Robinson, et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Dysart for the respondents.

Minn Marie Wilson,
Petitioner,
247 vs.
Margaret Jane Robinson, Jane Doe Robinson, John Doe Robinson, et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Dysart for the respondents.

Solomon Laurisden and Harry Kamps, Petitioners,
248 vs.
Louis H. Alexander and John Doe Alexander.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioners.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
249 vs.
Henri M. Sliosberg.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Foster Dulles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
250 vs.
Henri M. Sliosberg.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Foster Dulles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the respondent.

A. W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent of the President of the United States,
Petitioner,
251 vs.
C. B. Ivey and E. S. Estes.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Scott M. Loftin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roswell King for the respondents.

Mrs. L. E. Williams, individually and natural Tutrix of her minor son John Earl Williams,
Petitioner,
252 vs.
Great Southern Lumber Company.

The petition for a writof certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Generes Dufour for the respondent.

Benjamin A. Levy, Trustee of the Estate of Robert Jenkins Corporation,
Petitioner,
254 vs.
Anthony C. Post.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Hartstone for the petitioner, and by Mr. James H. Devine for the respondent.

Peter Martin,
Petitioner,
255 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Dinkelspeil for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Albert A. Zink, Roy Surcy, John Laviscount, et al.,
Petitioners,
257 vs.
Black Star Line and T. V. O'Conner, Chairman, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondents.

Commercial Credit Company,
Petitioner,
258 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the petitioner.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
259 vs.
International Products Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore Kiendl, Mr. John W. Davis, and Mr. Wm.C. Cannon for the petitioner, and by Mr. David Paine for the respondent.

City of New Brunswick, William G. Howell, Treasurer of the City of New Brunswick, et al.,
Petitioners,
260 vs.
The United States of America and United States Housing Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Edward L. Patterson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondents.

The Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians,
Petitioners,
261 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Sterling and Mr. Robert T. Tedrow for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George T. Stormont, and Mr. W. W. Scott for the respondent.

Sidney C. Borg, et al., as a Committee, etc., Acting under a Bondholders' Agreement,
Petitioner,
264 vs.
Illinois Terminal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan G. Moore, Mr. Alfred A. Cook, Mr. Charles S. Cutting, and Mr. William P. Sidley for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. S. Baker for the respondent.

Carrie Howard Steedman and Eugenia Howard Edmunds,
Petitioners,
265 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Bright and Mr. S. L. Swarts for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Frank K. Dyar for the respondent.

Alaska Packers Association,
Petitioner,
266 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and John Peterson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen L. Chickering for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the respondents.

Fred Smith,
Petitioner,
267 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan April for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Springfield Boiler Company and The Superheater Company,
Petitioners,
268 vs.
Babcock & Wilcox Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fritz v. Briesen, Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. William A. Redding, and Mr. John E. Hubbell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. Clarence B. Byrnes for the respondent.

Aileen E. Mitchell (Successor of C. Minkwitz, former Treasurer of Fort Bend County, Texas), as Treasurer of Fort Bend County, Texas, et al.,
Petitioners,
269 vs.
J. W. Hampel et al., Trustees in Bankruptcy, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. W. Gregory for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lewis R. Bryan for the respondents.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
270 vs.
M. Barry.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Wiley, Mr. Edward J. White, and Mr. Edgar B. Kinsworthy for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. F. Loughborough for the respondent.

Wong Gar Wah, Petitioner,
278 vs.
Walter E. Carr, District Director, United States Immigration Service, Los Angeles, California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Hott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Clyde Steamship Company, Petitioner,
279 vs.
Elizabeth Beer, as administratrix of the goods, chattels, & Credits of Adolph Beer, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold R. Medina for the respondent.

National Bank Supply Company, Inc., Petitioner,
280 vs.
Bankers Utilities Company, Inc., and Butler F. Greer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. P. Goepel, Mr. Charles E. Townsend, and Mr. William A. Loftus for the petitioner.

Ida Nolet Limoges and Honore Nolet, Petitioners,
281 vs.
Minnesota Iron Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Palmer and Mr. John B. Arnold for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank D. Adams and Mr. Elmer F. Blu for the respondent.

Charles B. Brewer, Petitioner,
282 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard L. Merrick for the petitioner.

The United States, Petitioner,
283 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company, E. R. Brown, R. Waverly Smith, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Barry Mohun and Mr. W. H. Francis for the respondents.

Neale, Inc., Edward G. Neale, Thomas N. Neale, et al., etc., et al., Petitioners,
284 vs.
Honorable Paul J. McCormick and Edward J. Henning, Judges, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Knight and Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioners.

Holland Furniture Company,
Petitioner,
285 vs.
Perkins Glue Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Davis and Mr. James A. Watson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gorham Crosby for the respondent.

The Clear Vision Pump Company,
Petitioner,
286 vs.
The Wichita Visible Gasoline Pump Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Hall, Mr. Alfred J. O'Brien, and Mr. Hal M. Black for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry W. Hart and Mr. Delos G. Haynes for the respondents.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
287 vs.
Steamship Harvey H. Brown,
Castner, Curran & Bullitt, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. McGrann for the respondents.

Jack Cavana,
Petitioner,
289 vs.
Addison Miller, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett J. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett for the respondent.

The United States of America ex relatione Ellery C. Stowell, Petitioner,
290 vs.
William C. Deming, George R. Wales, and Jessie Dell, Civil Service Commissioners, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellery C. Stowell and Mr. Albert H. Putney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondents.

Business Men's Assurance Company of America, Petitioner,
294 vs.
Dora A. Scott.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rees Turpin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace N. Hawkins for the respondent.

J. George Wright, Superintendent Osage Agency, for and on behalf of Estate of Gilbert Cox, etc., Petitioner,
295 vs.
C. E. Ashbrook, Legal Guardian of Catherine Cox, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Humphreys for the petitioner.

Beatrice Grayson Johnson, Petitioner,
297 vs.
Wright Thornburgh, as the Administrator of the Estate of Anna C. Thornburgh, deceased, et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. McCrory for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nathan A. Gibson for the respondents.

R. A. Jeanneret,
Petitioner,
298 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. R. Morrison and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bruce Scott and Mr. Kenneth F. Burgess for the respondent.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Isadore N. Hellman.
Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
Milton C. Hellman.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioner.

Robert L. Crook and Daniel H. Christman, Petitioners,
302 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson and Mr. C. H. Lewis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Paul Villere, Trustee of the Estate of John P. Rausch Co., Inc., Bankrupts, Petitioner,
303 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Percy S. Benedict for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. A. W. Gregg, and Mr. Albert T. Clark for the respondent.

Mike Fritzel,
Petitioner,
305 vs.
The United States of America.

William R. Rothstein,
Petitioner,
306 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernhardt Frank and Mr. Maclay Hoyne for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The United States, ex relatione Clinton M. Searl,
Petitioner,
307 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Toulmin and Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Eugene K. Pape, by Elsie Wilson Pape, His Guardian ad litem,
Petitioner,
308 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Overton G. Ellis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter for the respondent.

William L. Litzrodt,
Petitioner,
309 vs.
Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, Treasurer of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicito General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the respondents.

Chester La Mare,
Petitioner,
310 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Kinnane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company et al.,
Petitioners,
311 vs.
Mrs. Jessie B. Adkins, as Administratrix and Individually, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Andrews for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. C. Carter and Mr. Perry J. Lewis for the respondents.

Arkansas Wholesale Grocers Association, Reynolds-Davis Grocery Co., Griffin Grocery Co., et al.,
Petitioners,
312 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar Watkins and Mr. Mac Asbill for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Bayard T. Hainer, Mr. Adrien F. Busick, and Mr. Eugene W. Burr for the respondent.

Central National Bank Savings and Trust Company and Joseph A. Klein, Trustee,
Petitioners,
313 vs.
The Murphy Hotels Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. J. Needham and Mr. Austin V. Cannon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas H. Hogsett for the respondent.

Angola Transfer Company,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
The Texas & Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioner.

S. A. Swanson,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the petitioner.

Robert B. Armstrong and John M. Parker, Petitioners,
316 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Bachelder, Mr. A. J. Groesbeck, and Mr. Harold K. Bachelder for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Horace R. Lamb for the respondent.

Edgar Day,
Petitioner,
317 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Bachelder, Mr. A. J. Groesbeck, and Mr. Harold K. Bachelder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Horace R. Lamb for the respondent.

Grace A. Leathe,
Petitioner,
318 vs.
Title Guaranty Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Mayner Wallace and Mr. Henry S. Priest for the petitioner, and by Mr. Xenophon P. Wilfley, Mr. Fred L. Williams, and Mr. Earl F. Nelson for the respondent.

Alexandria Paper Company,
Petitioner,
320 vs.
Eibel Process Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the UnitedStates Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur M. Hood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harrison F. Lyman for the respondent.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
321 vs.
Edgar M. Wright, as Guardian of Nettie T. Henderson, a minor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. Douglas Arant and Mr. Frederick L. Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. P. Crum for the respondent.

Simon P. Lesselyoung,
Petitioner,
323 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Otto C. Curtz, Administrator of the Estate of Edward J. Gall, deceased,
Petitioner,
324 vs.
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert P. Whitney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wallace R. Middleton and Mr. Clifford B. Longley for the respondent.

No. 325. John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Red Jacket Consolidated Coal and Coke Company;

No. 326. The International Organization of the United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Borderland Coal Corporation, et al.;

No. 327. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Alpha Pocahontas Coal Company et al.;

No. 328. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Aetnae Sewell Smokeless Coal Company et al.;

No. 329. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Dry Branch Coal Company et al.;

No. 330. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Nelson Fuel Company et al.;

No. 331. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Leevale Coal Company and Hopkins Fork Coal Company;

No. 332. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Seng Creek Coal Company and Mordue Collieries Company;

No. 333. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Raleigh-Wyoming Coal Company, Hazy Eagle Collieries Company et al.;

No. 334. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Anchor Coal Company et al.;

No. 335. International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., petitioners, vs. Sterling Block Coal Company et al.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1927 - CONTINUED.

International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners,
336 vs.
Carbon Fuel Company et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., Mr Thomas C. Townsend and Mr. Henry Warrum for the petitioners, and by Mr. Albert M. Belcher, Mr. Edgar Greever, and Mr. Robert S. Spilman for the respondents.

The Williamsport Wire Rope Company, Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence A. Miller and Mr. James Walton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

George T. Shaw, Petitioner,
338 vs.
C. A. Owens.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Clements, Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, and Mr. Sidney L. Herold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Looney for the respondent.

Minnie E. Patterson, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits of William V. Patterson, deceased, Petitioner,
339 vs.
New York Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter A. Fullerton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sherman A. Murphy for the respondent.

Charles Erwin Brown,
Petitioner,
340 vs.
Pere Marquette Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Riley L. Crane for the petitioner, and by Mr. John C. Shields, Mr. George W. Weadock, and Mr. Vincent Weadock for the respondent.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner,
341 vs.
James R. Tindle and The Union Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Co-executors, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. James Walton for the respondents.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
342 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brenton K. Fisk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews and Mr. Alex. M. Bull for the respondents.

Hubert Work, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
344 vs.
Robert L. Braffet, Administrator of the Estate of Mark P. Braffet, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. E. O. Patterson, and Mr. O. H. Graves for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter Edmund Burke for the respondent.

Frank Dane, Petitioner,
345 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman, and Mr. Austin F. Canfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Finkelstein & Kommel, Petitioners,
346 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick W. Brooks, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lawrence for the respondent.

A. Lawrence Mills and John R. Gray, Petitioners,
348 vs.
Charles T. Sherman, First Trust and Savings Bank, a Corporation, and Louis Boisot, et al., Trustees.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. L. Wire for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas G. Long for the respondents.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
349 vs.
Franklin Jones, Administrator of the Estate of D. R. Ferguson, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Moore and Mr. J. J. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Ritchie L. Dunn, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of John Rothschild, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
350 vs.
Shell Company of California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence A. Shuey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward J. McCutchen for the respondent.

George Westcott Stearn, R. W. Warren, and S. T. Kent Oliver, Petitioners,
353 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. F. Railsback for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Guillermo Severino and Petra Absalon, Petitioners,
354 vs.
El Hogar Filipino, Sociedad Mutua de Construccion y Prestamos.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Rohde and Mr. Robert W. Jennings for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clyde A. DeWitt and Mr. Eugene A. Perkins for the respondent.

Gervasio Miraflores and Jose Miraflores, Petitioners,
355 vs.
El Hogar Filipino, Sociedad Mutua de Construccion y Prestamos.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Rohde and Mr. Robert W. Jennings for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clyde A. DeWitt and Mr. Eugene A. Perkins for the respondent.

Joseph S. Williams, Charles M. Boyd, Frank M. Eshleman, et al., Petitioners,
356 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip Rubenstein for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney

The Gulf and Ship Island Railroad Company, Petitioner,
357 vs.
Mrs. Rubie Curtis, Administratrix of the Estate of George D. Curtis, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Wills and Mr. R. W. Fletcher for the petitioner, and by Rubie Curtis, pro se.

W. L. Brown, Administrator of W. E. Brown, deceased, Petitioner,
358 vs.
Norfolk and Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Werth for the petitioner.

George D. Emery and Insurance Company of North America, Petitioner,
359 vs.
Ove Lange, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner.

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, Petitioner,
360 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson Gammans and Mr. Francis G. Caffey for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. George C. Butte for the respondent.

W. T. Irwin, Sherman & Ellis, Inc., Heco Envelope Co., et al., Petitioners,
361 vs.
The Missouri Valley Bridge & Iron Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kemper K. Knapp, Mr. John R. Cochran, Mr. Frank E. Tyler, and Mr. Joseph A. O'Donnell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lee Bond and Mr. Fred B. Silsbee for the respondent.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, Petitioner,
362 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Clements and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Lisle A. Smith for the respondent.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner,
363 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Clements and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

The People of the State of Illinois and Oscar E. Carlstrom, as Attorney General of the State of Illinois and John C. Fisher, et al., Petitioners,
367 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company and Southern Illinois and Kentucky Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Eugene Kelly and Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom for the petitioners, and by Mr. Walter S. Horton, Mr. Edward C. Craig, and Mr. Robert V. Fletcher for the respondent.

The Aetna Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut, Petitioner,
368 vs.
Licking Valley Milling Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Laurent for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. D. Rouse for the respondent.

George E. Truman, as County Treasurer of Pinal County, Arizona, J. C. Callaghan, as Treasurer, etc., et al., Petitioners,
369 vs.
Walter J. Thalheimer, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Florence Commercial Company, bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Murphy and Mr. Earl Anderson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henderson Stockton for the respondent.

Atlantic Lighterage Corporation, Petitioner,
371 vs.
Ernest Soderberg, managing owner of the barge "Alert," and Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Pierre M. Brown and Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner, and by Mr. George De Forest Lord for the respondent.

William McCully, Petitioner,
372 vs.
Monongahela Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William McCully pro se, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John Spalding Flannery, and Mr. Robert D. Dalzell for the respondent.

Franklin County, Arkansas, Petitioner,
373 vs.
Harriman National Bank.
Franklin County, Arkansas, Petitioner,
374 vs.
Sullivan County National Bank.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor and Mr. Vincent M. Miles for the petitioner.

Midland Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
375 vs.
Thomas Barkley et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor and Mr. Vincent M. Miles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles I. Evans for the respondents.

John J. Mitchell, Augustine L. Humes, and Illinois Merchants Trust Company, as Executors, Petitioners,
376 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Milward W. Martin and Mr. A. L. Humes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

M. B. Siegel, Inc., Petitioner,
377 vs.
City of Chicago.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer M. Leesman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson, Mr. James W. Breen, Mr. Edgar B. Tolman, and Mr. William H. Sexton for the respondent.

United States, Use of Union Gas Engine Company, Petitioner,
378 vs.
Newport Shipbuilding Corporation, Limited, National Surety Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund L. Jones, Mr. Frank J. Hogan, and Mr. Thomas M. Fields for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ellwood T. Morey and Mr. Wm. Henry White for the respondent.

Monty Morris,
Petitioner,
379 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Patrick Gilmore for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company,
Petitioner,
380 vs.
Carl F. Leverentz, Administrator of the Estate of Carl Edward Leverentz deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Root and Mr. A. C. Erdall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Montreville J. Brown for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
382 vs.
Del Lalbaugh and James Moxley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Thunen and Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby for the petitioner, and by Mr. James Moxley for the respondent.

Howard Moore,
Petitioner,
384 vs.
The City of Nampa.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Nye for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leon M. Fisk for the respondent.

Graff Furnace Company,
Petitioner,
385 vs.
Hans Machler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews and Mr. Philip V. Matte for the petitioner.

Ruby Steamship Corporation, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
386 vs.
Johnson & Higgins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cletus Keating and Mr. Ira A. Campbell for the respondent.

William R. George,
Petitioner,
389 vs.
The State of Idaho.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles J. Williamson for the petitioner and by Mr. Leon M. Fisk for the respondent.

Charlotte F. Jones,
Petitioner,
390 vs.
The Counties Gas and Electric Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Charlotte F. Jones, pro se.

The Lehigh and Hudson River Railway Company, Petitioner,
393 vs.
John H. Hubbard.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert A. Taylor for the petitioner.

Charles W. Bostrom, Lawrence W. Lawson, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
395 vs.
Cuyamel Fruit Company, claimant and owner of Steamship "Nicaroa," and W. G. Coyle and Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioners.

George F. Willet, et al.,
Petitioners,
396 vs.
Robert F. Herrick, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Norfolk, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sherman L. Whipple, Mr. Joseph Wiggin, and Mr. Boyd B. Jones for the petitioners, and by Mr. Malcolm Donald, Mr. Thomas Hunt, Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry, and Mr. George L. Mayberry for the respondents.

Union Bank and Trust Company of Helena, Montana,
Petitioners,
397 vs.
Lester H. Loble, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Gans & Klein Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. S. Gunn for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. G. McIntire for the respondent.

Jacob Woitte, Frank M. Bates, Joseph Essex, et al.,
Petitioners,
398 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. C. Faulkner for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Josephine H. Plane,
Petitioner,
402 vs.
Walter E. Carr, as District Director of Immigration of the United States for the District of Los Angeles.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger O'Donnell and Mr. J. Edward Keating for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Jerry R. McCoy,
Petitioner,
403 vs.
A. S. J. Shaw, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma and The Pure Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin Dabney for the respondents.

Fred Ludwig, Alfred A. Gotshall and Leland L. Morris, Partners, etc.,
Petitioners,
405 vs.
W. S. Raydure, as partnership, Selina Raydure, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert H. Miller and Mr. Charles H. Brady for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank A. Baldwin for the respondents.

Pittsburgh Hotels Company,
Petitioner,
406 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George R. Beneman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Alexander H. McCormick for the respondent.

Frank P. Blair,
Petitioner,
419 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Good, Mr. James B. Westcott, and Mr. W. Warfield Ross for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Frank K. Dyar for the respondent.

Globe Indemnity Company of New York,
Petitioner,
420 vs.
County of Scotts Bluff, Nebraska, Peter B. Schmidt, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Matthew A. Hall, Mr. Raymond G. Young, and Mr. Harvey M. Johnsen for the petitioner.

Louis Schrijver, Adolph Krijn, and Lehman Rudolph Krijn, co-partners, etc.,
Petitioners,
421 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney Post Simpson, Mr. Goldthwaite H. Dorr, and Mr. Robert F. Cogswell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the respondent.

Modern Workmen of the World, The Modern Workmen of World Society, Samuel J. Master, et al.,
Petitioners,
422 vs.
Charles A. Hartmann, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Bissell Thomas, Mr. Walter H. Newton, and Mr. J. K. M. Norton for the petitioners.

Stock Yards Loan Company, Petitioner,
423 vs.
Commercial National Bank of Independence, Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry M. Ward, Mr. Henry L. McCune, and Mr. David A. Murphy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles W. German for the respondent.

Edward E. Jenkins, as Receiver of the National City Bank of Salt Lake City, Utah, et al., Petitioners,
424 vs.
National Surety Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeal for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. M. Bagley, Mr. John Jensen, and Mr. Harold M. Stephens for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ray Van Cott for the respondent.

Midland National Bank of Minneapolis, Petitioner,
425 vs.
Dakota Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andreas Ueland for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Hanten for the respondent.

Samuel M. Hastings, as Administrator of the Estate of Thomas Rankin, deceased, Petitioner,
426 vs.
Frank Graham Jones.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kemper K. Knapp and Mr. John R. Cochran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Caruthers Ewing and Mr. Thomas Francis Lowe for the respondent.

Morton E. Converse & Son Company, Petitioner,
428 vs.
H. C. White Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Hall and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. James J. Kennedy for the respondent.

Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Company, Petitioner,
429 vs.
State of Arkansas ex rel. Attorney General.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Canada for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. W. Applegate, Mr. Joe T. Robinson, Mr. J. W. House, and Mr. C. H. Moses for the respondent.

Oil Fields Corporation, Petitioner,
432 vs.
John S. Dashko, T. P. Novick, Olga Novick, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert L. Wilson for the petitioner.

City of Gainesville, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Brown-Crummer Investment Company, Southern Surety Company, and H. O. Head, Executor of H. W. Head.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. O. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. C. Dillard, Mr. Rice Maxey, and Mr. H. O. Head for the respondents.

C. W. Bassett, A. Pincolini, and G. D. Madalena, Petitioners,
434 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sardis Summerfield for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

R. C. Clapp, Petitioner,
435 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of Mr. Robert C. Faulston for the petitioner, and by the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Massachusetts Bonding and Insurance Company, Petitioner,
436 vs.
National Surety Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert C. Smyth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. James Marshall for the respondent.

Barney Pearlman, Petitioner,
438 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hall S. Lusk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Lawrence J. Kosters for the respondent.

The Manna Stoker Company,
Petitioner,
439 vs.
Locomotive Stoker Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter F. Murray, Mr. Drury W. Cooper, and Mr. J. Snowden Bell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Paul Synnestvedt for the respondent.

Philippine National Bank,
Petitioner,
440 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Loughran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Allan C. Rowe for the respondent.

Green-Moore & Co., Inc., J. E. Lowe and Crawford Doyle,
Petitioners,
441 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. McCoy and Mr. C. T. Hawkins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter and Mr. Perry G. Michener for the respondent.

The O. K. Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
442 vs.
The Bassick Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred M. Allen and Mr. W. B. Turner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lynn A. Williams for the respondent.

The Larkin Automotive Parts Company, Petitioner,
443 vs.
The Bassick Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred M. Allen and Mr. W. B. Turner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lynn A. Williams for the respondent.

Maurice Kay and Benjamin Kay, Petitioners,
444 vs.
Edgar C. Snyder, United States Marshal, etc., and Needham C. Turnage, United States Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Easby-Smith, Mr. David A. Pine, Mr. A. L. Newmyer, and Mr. Milton W. King for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Norwegian American Securities Corporation, Petitioner,,
445 vs.
Henry H. Kaufman, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ralph F. Colin for the respondent.

Charley Hee, alias Dong Bow Hee, Petitioner,
446 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Fairbanks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Robert H. Aldredge,
Petitioner,
447 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Douglas for the petitioner, and by Mr. Douglas W. Robert for the respondent.

Goon Bon June,
Petitioner,
448 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Bates Farr and Mr. Everett Flint Damon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Frank M. Parrish for the respondent.

Tribond Sales Corporation,
Petitioner,
450 vs.
Harry S. New, Postmaster General of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. F. Colladay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Sarah Marcus Greenberg,
Petitioner,
451 vs.
The Pennsylvania Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Trustee in Bankrupty.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Benner for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
452 vs.
James M. Russell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. James F. Green for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Morrow for the respondent.

Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Columbia, South Carolina, Petitioner,
456 vs.
Chas. S. Mitchell, W. E. Richardson, Truckers Supply Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. W. Robinson for the petitioner.

American Exchange Irving Trust Company, Petitioner,
457 vs.
Leon Bonnasse, Joseph Bonnasse, et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston and Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the respondents.

Patrick A. McDonnell, Petitioner,
458 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. LaRue Brown and Mr. William B. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Republic of France, Compagnie Franco-Indo-Chinoise and Engineering Timber Company, Ltd.,
Petitioners,
459 vs.
French Overseas Corporation, as owner of the schooner "Malcolm Baxter, Jr."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. Mark W. Maclay, Mr. Robert S. Erskine, and Mr. Charles K. Carpenter for the petitioners, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar, Mr. T. Catesby Jones, and Mr. James W. Ryan for the respondent.

Elmer C. Dyer et al.,
Petitioners,
460 vs.
George A. Stauffer, as Marshal, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. G. Denman and Mr. Herbert W. Hauts for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondents.

The New Britain Machine Company, a corporation under the laws of the State of Ohio,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
Emma Cone.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Seasongood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank F. Dinsmore for the respondent.

The City of New York,
Petitioner,
466 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Nicholson for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the respondent.

Riverside Oil & Refining Company, Petitioner,
469 vs.
Cimarron River Oil Company, Sophie Mussellem, M. S. Mussellem, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Oakes and Mr. Thos. D. Lyons for the petitioner, and by Mr. John J. Shea, Mr. H. M. Gray, Mr. Wesley E. Disney, Mr. Anthony P. Nugent, and Mr. C. K. Newman for the respondents.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
470 vs.
Martin Woodward.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Hackney, Mr. Edward J. White, and Mr. Leslie A. Welch for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Hogsett for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
472 vs.
Hildur Haglund, as Administratrix of the Estate of Ernest Haglund, deceased, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Denman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the respondents.

Southern Pacific Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
473 vs.
Moore Shipbuilding Company, a corporation, and Ralph Navigation & Coal Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Denman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the respondents.

Peoples Transit Company,
Petitioner,
474 vs.
George A. Henshaw et al., receivers of the Oklahoma Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren K. Snyder for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Dudley for the respondents.

Pere Marquette Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
475 vs.
Frank Farrelli.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney C. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herbert H. Patterson for the respondent.

Alfred Leeb and Louis Nova, co-partners, doing business under the firm name and style of Batjer & Company, Petitioners,
476 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Russell and Mr. Benj. A. Levitt for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. K. L. Campbell for the respondent.

Old Honesty Oil Company,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
Clara B. Shuler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Finis E. Riddle for the petitioner.

Van Dusen Harrington Company,
Petitioner,
478 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert C. Remele for the petitioner, and by Mr. Asa G. Briggs for the respondent.

James R. Caton, Joseph C. Koogle, Fannie P. Gilbert, et al.,
Petitioners,
479 vs.
Michigan Sanitarium and Benevolent Association, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John Spalding Flannery, Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, Mr. Henry C. Clark, Mr. George V. Tripleet, Jr., Mr. W. C. Sullivan, and Mr. Roger J. Whiteford for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, Mr. Stanton C. Peelle, Mr. Dale D. Drain, and Mr. William H. Donovan for the respondents.

Joe Parente and Armando Bonacorsi,
Petitioners,
480 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. McMillan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Joseph J. Weinhandler,
Petitioner,
481 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David V. Cahill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Glendola Steamship Corporation,
Petitioner,
482 vs.
Standard Oil Company(N.J.).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sanford H. E. Freund and Mr. Horace M. Gray for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. McGrann for the respondent.

Cornell Steamboat Company,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
State Industrial Board and Ida C. Benson, widow, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry H. Flemming for the petitioner.

Boston Insurance Company of Boston, Massachusetts,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
John S. Sorenson and T. B. S. Nielsen, Copartners, trading under the name, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. P. Whip for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank B. Ober and Mr. D. Roger Englar for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
486 vs.
W. M. Hayes, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter for the petitioner, and by Mr. John J. Shea for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
487 vs.
Cimarron River Oil Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. B. Ames, Mr. H. M. Gray, Mr. John J. Shea, Mr. Anthony P. Nugent, Mr. Wesley E. Disney, and Mr. C. F. Newman for the respondents.

Commonwealth Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
488 vs.
Louisa C. Aichner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lambert C. Walther, Mr. John S. Leahy, and Mr. Walter H. Saunders for the petitioner.

Reeves Coal and Dock Company,
E. T. McDonald, Receiver, etc.,
Petitioner,
489 vs.
George E. Geddes.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. H. Boutelle and Mr. A. E. Boyesen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold G. Simpson for the respondent.

Mollie Tiger, and Baby Cumsey, by C. L. Garber, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
490 vs.
F. S. Lozier, C. F. Robertson, J. Garfield Buell, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the petitioners, and by Mr. George S. Ramsey, Mr. Alvin Richards, and Mr. John M. Chick for the respondents.

Camp Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
491 vs.
S. Liles Miller, Administrato of the Estate of D. B. Miller, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. G. Garnett for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. W. Robinson for the respondent.

Union Freight Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
492 vs.
Batchelder & Snyder Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Blackman for the petitioner.

Roy Olmstead, Jerry L. Finch, Clarence G. Healy, et al.,
Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

E. E. Easton,
Petitioner,
494 vs.
Susan T. Brant, C. M. Sperry, Southwestern Securities Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Wylie for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. W. O'Melveny and Mr. Walter K. Tuller for the respondents.

Clinchfield Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
495 vs.
Elise H. Dunn, Administratrix of the Estate of Milledge D. Hunnicutt, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jas. J. McLaughlin and Mr. John W. Price for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert Burrow for the respondent.

The Carter Oil Company, J. Wood Glass, F. A. Calvert, et al.,
Petitioners,
496 vs.
Taylor Eli, James Eli, Charlotte Chuculate, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. George E. Chamberlain, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, Mr. James A. Veasey, and Mr. George S. Ramsey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Daniel Haden Linebaugh and Mr. Paul Pinson for the respondents.

Warren E. Brown, First National Bank of Dover, First National Bank of Upper Sandusky, et al.,
Petitioners,
497 vs.
Louis H. Krietmeyer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. W. L. Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Giles J. Patterson for the respondent.

Kerr Steamship Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
498 vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elkan Turk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Peter F. McAllister for the respondent.

John Pleich, Sr.,
Petitioner,
499 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jay Good for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Thomas J. Casey,
Petitioner,
500 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Casey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Lewis G. Morton,
Petitioner,
502 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, Mr. E. O. Patterson, and Mr. E. T. Burke for the respondent.

Wolf Mineral Process Corporation,
Petitioner,
503 vs.
Minerals Separation North American Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry W. Anderson and Mr. William M. Chadbourne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles McH. Howard, Mr. Henry D. Williams, Mr. William Houston Kenyon, and Mr. Lindley M. Garrison for the respondent.

Wehr Company,
Petitioner,
504 vs.
Roy J. Winsor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Theodore K. Bryant for the respondent.

Czarnikow-Rionda Company,
Petitioner,
506 vs.
West Market Grocery Company (formerly known as Sheppard Strassheim Co,).

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Garrard Glenn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ralph Merriam for the respondent.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
508 vs.
Terry Packing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stockton, Mr. J. Nelson Frierson, and Mr. Branch P. Kerfoot for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward L. Craig for the respondent.

No. 510. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S.A., petitioner, vs. Fireman's Fund Insurance Company;

No. 511. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, vs. Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company;

No. 512. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A. petitioner, vs. Northwestern Fire & Marine Insurance Company;

No. 513. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, vs. Hartford Fire Insurance Company;

No. 514. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, vs. National Liberty Insurance Company;

No. 515. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A. petitioner, vs. Aetna Insurance Company;

No. 516. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, vs. Western Assurance Company;

No. 517. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, vs. Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Company, Ltd.;

No. 518. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, vs. Springfield Fire & Marine Insurance Company;

No. 519. The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, vs. Franklin Fire Insurance Company;

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner,
520 vs.
Pheonix Insurance Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones, Mr. Henry P. Dart, Jr., and Mr. Robert H. Kelley for the respondents.

William H. Wohlstatter, next friend of Jew Lee,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
A. W. Brough, Chinese Inspector in Charge at the Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Bates Farr for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Star Ball Player Company,
Petitioner,
523 vs.
The Playograph Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Johnston, Mr. J. Granville Meyers, and Mr. Charles S. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph H. Milans and Mr. Calvin T. Milans for the respondent.

Lucinda Haldeman, as administratrix of the goods, chattels, rights and credits, which were of Fred Haldeman, deceased,

Petitioner,

525 vs.

Reading Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Ludlow for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach for the respondent.

Michael F. Loughman, President of the State Tax Commission and John J. Merrill, et al., State Tax Commissioners, etc.,

Petitioners,

526 vs.

Martha J. Smith, as sole executrix of the last will and testament of Mary J. Smith, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert Ottinger for the petitioners, and by Mr. John L. McMaster for the respondent.

Fordson Coal Company,

Petitioner,

528 vs.

Wiley Spurlock, T. H. Webb, Taylor Spurlock, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wallace R. Middleton, Mr. Clifford B. Longley, and Mr. Cleon K. Calvert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Morris for the respondent.

Charles S. Green, Emory A. Kern, Z.J. Hendrick, et al.,

Petitioners,

532 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur E. Griffin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne, for the respondent.

Edward H. McInnis,
Petitioner,
533 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank R. Jeffrey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Karl Buzynski,
Petitioner,
534 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., and The Texas Contracting Company, Inc.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Wayman for the petitioner.

Jerome C. Farquhar,
Petitioner,
535 vs.
William M. Henderson and Plymouth Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. H. D. Rummel, Mr. John S. Weller, Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., and Mr. Thomas J. Walsh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Owen J. Roberts, Mr. Charles M. Thorp, and Mr. Earl F. Reed for the respondent.

Hudson Coal Company,
Plaintiff in error,
136 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Star Motor Drivers Association, The Blue Ribbon Auto Drivers Association of Michigan for the use, etc., Harry A. Dietz, et al., Plaintiffs in error,

111 vs.

City of Dtroit, James W. Inches, Commissioner, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. E. N. Barnard for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

J. Mell Brooks and Blytheville Special School District No. 5, Plaintiffs in error,

88 vs.

Ralph Koonce, as State Treasurer of the State of Arkansas.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. P. A. Lasley for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Swift & Company, et al., and Armour & Company, et al.

181 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for Swift & Company, et al., and continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Hall, It is ordered that Frank L. Belknap, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, It is ordered that John L. Kenefick, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, It is ordered that Harry C. Barron, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, It is ordered that James Wiseman Macdonald, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Wainright, It is ordered that Melvin D. Wilson, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Swift & Company, et al., and
Armour & Company, et al.,
181 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the American Wholesale Grocers' Association et al., interveners, by special leave of Court, and concluded by Mr. William C. Breed for the National Wholesale Grocers of the United States, intervener, by special leave of Court.

John W. Blodgett,
154 vs.
Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. Mark Norris for Blodgett, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for Holden, Collector.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
176 vs.
Standard Oil Company of Kentucky.
Standard Oil Company, Incorporated in Kentucky, Petitioner,
177 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, and by Mr. Charles G. Middleton for the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
194 vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., It is ordered that Edward S. Memphill, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, It is ordered that Charles Thomas Lewis, Jr., of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, It is ordered that W. T. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey,
Appellant,
101 vs.
Middlesex Water Company.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Thomas Brown, leave was granted to file a brief for the appellant in this case.

The Carter Oil Company, J. Wood Glass, F. A. Calvert, et al., Petitioners,
496 vs.
Taylor Eli, James Eli, Charlotte Chuculate, etc., et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the petitioners, leave was granted to file a supplement to the reply brief for the petitioner by Monday next, with leave to counsel for the respondent to file a reply thereto within one week.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company, Petitioner,
194 vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondent.

No. 211. T. H. Smallwood, W. F. Smallwood, A. D. Smallwood, et al., etc., petitioners, vs. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 212. Adolfo Valdes Ordonez, Salvador Garcia, Victor Ochoa, et al., etc., petitioners, vs. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 213. Insular Motor Corporation, petitioner, vs. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 214. Adolfo Valdes, Pio Perez, Luis C. Cuyar, et al., etc., petitioners, vs. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 215. Finlay, Waymouth & Lee, Inc., petitioner, vs. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico;

No. 216. Angel Abarca Portilla, Rafael Abarca Portilla, Enrique Abarca Sanfeliz, et al., etc., petitioners, vs. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frank G. Caffey, of counsel for the petitioners in Nos. 211, 212, and 213; and continued by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the petitioners, in Nos. 214, 215, and 216.

Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer, Appellant,
164 vs.
Santini Fertilizer Company.

This case was argued by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the appellant, and by Mr. Nelson Gammans for the appellee.

News Syndicate Company,

235 vs.

The New York Central Railroad Company, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the News Syndicate Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell, It is ordered that Murray Bourne, Esquire, of Fresno, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alva D. Adams, It is ordered that Lester Goodwin Budlong, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that M. A. Ned Looney, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. R. Serven, It is ordered that Ernest L. Walton, Esquire, of Bainville, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace Andrews, It is ordered that James E. MacCloskey,Jr., of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Armitage, It is ordered that Charles E. F. McCann, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

News Syndicate Company
235 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the News Syndicate Co., and concluded by Mr. Parker McCollester for the New York Central R.R. Co., et al.

Southern California Edison Company, Petitioner,
188 vs.
Amelia Herminghaus, Bertha Genevieve Bottoms, Victoria Pearl Womack, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

F. H. Mason,
Petitioner,
152 vs.
C. F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

Leave granted to James E. McCloskey,Jr., to file brief as amicus curiae. This case was argued by Mr. Horace Andrews and Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

L. M. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota, Petitioner,
156 vs.
Milton Dairy Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Ira C. Oehler for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 O'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1927.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert R. Henden, Jr., It is ordered that L. D. McPherson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. Hofheins, It is ordered that John H. Clogston, Esquire, of Buffalo,, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman M. Langworthy, It is ordered that Thomas S. McPheeters, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

L. M. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota, Petitioner,
156 vs.
Milton Dairy Company.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Ira C. Oehler for the respondent.

The Liberty National Bank of Roanoke, Virginia,
Petitioner,
218 vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee in Bankruptcy of W. L. Becker & Company, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. James D. Johnston for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. D. Apperson for the respondents.

W. C. Tucker,
Petitioner,
167 vs.
Acel C. Alexander, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles H. Garnett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
219 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased;
C. G. Lewellyn, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
220 vs.
The Colonial Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.

These cases were argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioners, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
157 vs.
W. A. McFarland and J. Norris McFarland, Copartners, trading as Henry Marcus & Son.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. S. Bohannon for the petitioner.

next

MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William T. S. Curtis, It is ordered that John L. Tye, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Watkins, It is ordered that Charles Scott, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Irvine L. Lenroot, It is ordered that John A. C. Lightner, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Rose, It is ordered that H. M. Trieber and Clifton W. Gray, Esquires, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Irvine L. Lenroot, It is ordered that Robert Kelly Prentice, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur E. Cook, It is ordered that Herbert Mathews, Esquire, of Lakewood, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wylie M. Barrow, It is ordered that James T. Kilbreth, Esquire, of New York City, and Cullen R. Liskow, Esquire, of Lake Charles, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Mammoth Oil Company, Sinclair Crude Oil Purchasing Company, and Sinclair Pipe Line Company, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 140

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States, ex rel. Skinner and Eddy Corporation, Petitioner,
30 vs.
J. M. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs against the relator.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis,

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc., Petitioner,
190 vs.
Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius, et al., Petitioners
191 vs.
William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Busses Corporation, Petitioner,
197 vs.
William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. Plamals,
Petitioner,
225 vs.
The Steamship "Pinar del Rio". her engines, boilers, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Hampton, Jr., & Co.,
Petitioner,
242 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
293 vs.
The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 21st next, after the criminal cases assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Ohio on relation of National Mutual Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error,
430 vs.
William C. Safford, Superintendent of Insurance etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Ohio, on relation of The Celina Mutual Casualty Company,

Plaintiff in error,

431 vs.

William C. Safford, Superintendent of Insurance etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey,

Appellant,

101 vs.

Middlesex Water Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal ~~in this cause~~ be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. S. Wheeler and M. S. Galasso,

Plaintiffs in error,

253 vs.

Galen D. Pue.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. S. Wheeler and M. S. Calasso,

Plaintiffs in error,

253 vs.

Galen D. Pue.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Delaware, Pennsylvania,

Plaintiff in error,

276 vs.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

School District of Tinicum Township, Pennsylvania,

Plaintiff in error,

277 vs.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 1. Rhederie M. Jebsen Company, appellant, v. The United States.

No. 2. The Firm of M. Jebsen, Corresponding Owner of the Steamship Company, et al., etc., appellants, v. The United States.

No. 3. Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 4. Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 5. Atlas Line Steamship Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 6. Atlas Line Steamship Company, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 7. North German Lloyd, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 8. North German Lloyd, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 9. North German Lloyd, appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 10. Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft, etc., appellant, vs. The United States.

No. 11. Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft, etc., appellant, vs. The United States.

Deutsch-Australische Dampfschiffs-Gesellschaft, Appellant,
12 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to pass these cases, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and it hereby is, granted and the cases are set for argument on March 5, 1928.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Nevada, Complainant,
4, Orig.
Crown Willamette Paper Company.

On consideration of a stipulation of counsel filed in this cause, It is now here ordered that this cause be, and the same hereby is, continued until the next term, with leave to the parties to make such stipulation for the realtions between them during the interval in respect to the subject matter of the case as they may be advised.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Rich,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the motion to postpone the submission of the petition for a writ of certiorari, in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pueblo of Santa Rosa,
Petitioner,
511, October Term 1926.
vs.
Albert B. Fall, Secretary of Interior, et al.

On consideration of the motion to correct the mandate and modify the judgment in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
394 vs.
Glenn Murray.

It is now here ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 24th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. Dittburner,
Plaintiff in error,
383 vs.
The State of Tennessee.

It is now here ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, October 24th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commercial Credit Company,
Petitioner,
258 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby assigned for argument on Monday, November 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Howell,

Plaintiff in error,

437 vs.

The State of Georgia.

It is now here ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, November 21st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Genna,

Petitioner,

347 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the Order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Genna,

Petitioner,

347 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Molton Brasseaux,

Petitioner,

351 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Molton Brasseaux,

Petitioner,

351 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:

William Faltin,

352. Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:

William Faltin,

Petitioner,

352.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. D. Austin,

Petitioner,

427 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. D. Austin,

Petitioner,

427 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John B. Lemieux, Peter Lemieux, Maggie Martineau, et al.,

Petitioners,

549 vs.

Agate Land Company and City of Superior.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Petitioner,

150 October Term, 1926.

vs.

Stone and Downer Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

See original judgment entered Oct.10,1927, at page 753 minutes 1926.

The petition for a rehearing is denied.

Ordered: That the opinion filed in this case shall be modified to read as follows:

The first sentence which reads

"This is a proceeding by certiorari to review the judgment of the Court of Customs Appeals in the classification for duty of thirteen importations of wool in the fleece and in the yarn",

shall read in the official opinion as follows:

"This is a proceeding by certiorari to review the judgment of the Court of Customs Appeals in the classification for duty of nine importations of wool in the fleece, one of cloth and one of yarn".

Second. The paragraph of the opinion stating the question involved, which reads as follows:

"Second. If it does not so operate, was the Court of Customs Appeals right in holding that twelve of the thirteen importations herein are entitled to come in as wool of the sheep under the Tariff Act of October 13, 1913 (c.16, 38 Stat. 114), and not as clothing wool under paragraphs 18 and 19 of the Emergency Tariff Act of May 27, 1921 (c. 14, 42 Stat. 9, 10)?",

shall read as follows:

"Second. If it does not so operate, was the Court of Customs Appeals right in holding that the importations of wool herein are entitled to come in as wool of the sheep under the Tariff Act of October 3, 1913 (c. 16, 38 Stat. 114), and not as clothing wool under paragraph 18 of the Emergency Tariff Act of May 27, 1921 (c. 14, 42 Stat. 9, 10)?"

Third. The Last sentence in the opinion which reads

"What we have said leads to the conclusion that we must reverse the Court of Customs Appeals, except in respect to its ruling on the 13th importation, which it classified as within paragraphs 18 and 19",

should be amended by striking out the words

"except in respect to its ruling on the 13th importation, which it classified as within paragraphs 18 and 19".

The language of the judgment of the Court, which now reads that the judgment below is "reversed in part and affirmed in part" should be modified by striking out the words "in part and affirmed in part."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John B. Lemieux, Peter Lemieux,
Maggie Martineau, et al.,
Petitioners,
549 vs.
Agate Land Company and City of
Superior,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Frank A. Turner,
Petitioner.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in this cause, and to proceed further in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied; with leave to the petitioner to apply to the District Judges for the Northern District of California, or to the Circuit Judges therein, for hearing of such petition.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. E. Harlin, Norta Harlin, and the
American Investment Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
165 vs.
Mary Gage, Columbus LeFlore and
Lorena LeFlore.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordred and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. E. Harlin, Norta Harlin, and the American Investment Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
165 vs.
Mary Gage, Columbus Le Flore and Lorena Le Flore.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. L. E. Williams, Individually and Natural Tutrix of her Minor Son John Earl Williams,
Petitioner,
252 vs.
Great Southern Lumber Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commercial Credit Company,
Petitioner,
258 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of New Brunswick, Wm. G. Howell, Treasurer of the City of New Brunswick, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America and U. S. Housing Corporation.

260

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alaska Packers Association, Petitioner, vs. Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and John Peterson.

266

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aileen E. Mitchell, (Successor of C. Minkwitz, former Treasurer of Fort Bend County, Texas) as Treasurer of Fort Bend County, Texas, et al., Petitioners, vs. J. W. Hampel, et al., Trustees in Bankruptcy, et al.

269

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Verner, Sole Executor under
the will of Emily L. Moore, deceased,
Petitioner,
222 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John D. Chapman,
Petitioner,
232 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. F. McMurray,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
The Choctaw Nation of Indians and
The Chickasaw Nation of Indians.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Choctaw Nation of Indians and
the Chickasaw Nation of Indians, Petitioners, vs. J. F. McMurray. 245

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis Merchants Bridge
Terminal Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Edna LaLone, Administratrix of the Estate of Maurice La Lone, deceased. 237

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis, Petitioner, vs. James Swain. 238

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Caruthers,

Petitioner,

239 vs.

Henry B. Hines and Cal T. Scott.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Apolinaria Solon,

Petitioner,

241 vs.

The Government of the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Detroit Steel Products Company,

Petitioner,

243 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the arguemtn of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rembrandt M. Peale,

Petitioner,

244 vs.

Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, William M. Jardine, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Katie Roberts Wilson,

Petitioner,

246 vs.

Margaret Jane Robinson, Jane Doe Robinson, John Doe Robinson, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minn Marie Wilson,

Petitioner,

247 vs.

Margaret Jane Robinson, Jane Doe Robinson, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Solomon Laurisden and Harry Kamps, Petitioners,
248 vs.
Louis H. Alexander and John Doe Alexander.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
249 vs.
Henri M. Sliosberg.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
250 vs.
Henri M. Sliosberg.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent of the President of the United States, Petitioner,

251 vs.

C. B. Ivey and E. S. Estes.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin A. Levy, Trustee of the Estate of Robert Jenkins Corporation, Petitioner,

254 vs.

Anthony C. Post.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Martin, Petitioner,

255 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert A. Zink, Roy Surcy, John
Laviscount, et al.,
Petitioners,
257 vs.
Black Star Line and T. V. O'Connor,
Chairman, United States Shipping
Board, Garnishee.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
259 vs.
International Products Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of
Sioux Indians,
Petitioners,
261 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sidney C. Borg et al., as Committee, etc., Acting under a Bondholders' Agreement,
Petitioners,
264 vs.
Illinois Terminal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carrie Howard Steedman and Eugenia Howard Edmunds,
Petitioners,
265 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred Smith,
Petitioner,
267 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Springfield Boiler Company and The
Superheater Company,
Petitioners,
268 vs.
Babcock & Wilcox Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
270 vs.
M. Barry.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wong Gar Wah,
Petitioner,
278 vs.
Walter E. Carr, District Director
United States Immigration Service,
Los Angeles, California.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clyde Steamship Company,

Petitioner,

279 vs.

Elizabeth Beer, as administratrix of the goods, chattels, and credits of Adolph Beer, deceased.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Bank Supply Company, Inc., Petitioner,

280 vs.

Bankers Utilities Company, Inc., and Butler F. Greer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ida Nolet Limoges and Honore Nolet, Petitioners,

281 vs.

Minnesota Iron Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel M. Hastings, as Administrator of the Estate of Thomas Rankin, deceased,

Petitioner,

426 vs.

Frank Graham Jones.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Claudian B. Northrop in behalf of counsel for the respondent, suggesting the death of Frank Graham Jones, party respondent in this cause; and he having moved the Court to substitute Nina K. Jones, Executrix etc., as the party respondent in this cause,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charlotte F. Jones,

Petitioner,

390 vs.

The Counties Gas and Electric Company.

The motion for judgment by default in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Charlotte F. Jones, pro se.

George McNeir,

Petitioner,

192 vs.

Charles W. Anderson, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Bernhard Knollenberg in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Mrs. Andrew Carnegie as amicus curiae in this case.

Fordson Coal Company,

Petitioner,

528 vs.

Wiley Spurlock, T. H. Webb, Taylor Spurlock, et al.

On motion made to the court by Mr. Cleon K. Calvert in that behalf, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief on behalf of the petitioner in this case.

Dunbar-Dukate Company, Incorporated,

Plaintiff in error,

44 vs.

The Celeste Sugar Company, Incorporated.

The motion to abate this case or to substitute the parties defendant in error was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. W. Wilkinson in that behalf, with leave to file printed motion within five days.

Warren E. Brown, First National Bank of Dover, et al.,

Petitioners,

497 vs.

Louis H. Krietmeyer.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in that behalf, leave was granted to file a reply brief of the petitioners.

A. B. Caplinger, as County Judge of Poinsett County, Arkansas,

Petitioner,

538 vs.

United States on relation of Harriman National Bank.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the respondent by Friday, next.

Thomas H. Dent, as Administrator of Elmira Holland, deceased.

Plaintiff in error,

46 vs.

James S. Swilley.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari for diminution of the record in this cause, made by Mr. Charles H. Bates in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Rich,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Eugene Kelly and Mr. Thornton M. Pratt for the petitioner, and by Mr. William W. Potter for the respondent.

Ernest Wiltsee, on behalf of himself, Arthur J. Stevens, et al.,
Petitioners,
524 vs.
Francis R. Hart, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis Kohlman, Mr. Sherman L. Whipple, and Mr. Arthur D. Hill for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Jr., and Mr. Nathan Matthews for the respondents.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent,
Petitioner,
529 vs.
World Publishing Company.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent,
Petitioner,
530 vs.
Tulsa Paper Company.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent,
Petitioner,
531 vs.
Democrat Printing Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex M. Bull and Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner and Mr. John J. Shea for the respondents.

Munson Steamship Line,
Petitioner,
537 vs.
Dampskibs Aktieselskabet Jeanette Skinner, owner of the Norwegian Steamship "John Peakke."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark W. Maclay and Mr. Frank A. Bernero for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Griffin and Mr. Herbert K. Stockton for the respondent.

A. B. Caplinger, as County Judge of Poinsett County, Arkansas,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
United States on relation of Harriman National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. B. Caplinger, pro se.

Frederick A. Cook,
Petitioner,
539 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H.C. Wade for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Louise Foster for the respondent.

Morgan & Bird Gravel Company, Inc., represented by J. P. Wilkinson, receiver,
Petitioner,
544 vs.
M. T. Walker et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. Huffman Lewis and Mr. J. D. Wilkinson for the petitioner.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Petitioner,
545 vs.
G. F. Grohe-Henrich & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. William C. Cannon, and Mr. Theodore Kiendl for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry G. Hotchkiss and Mr. Wm. H. White, Jr., for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
157 vs.
W. A. McFarland and J. Norris McFarland, Copartners, trading etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. J. S. Bohannon for the petitioner, by Mr. William H. Hudgins for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Lothrop Withington for the respondents.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
210 vs.
Oesterlein Machine Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod for the respondent.

Brimstone Railroad & Canal Company, Appellant,
240 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. C. R. Liskow for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Fay Carr, It is ordered that George W. Weyand and Herbert A. Hickman, Esquires, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward N. Pagelsen, It is ordered that Charles A. Meyer, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. Trimble, It is ordered that Theodore Rassfeur, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Carroll Blakely Low, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond M. Beebe, It is ordered that John L. Steinbugler, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Myer L. Orlov, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Victor Ford Collins, Esquire, of Los Angeles State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. William Ramseyer, It is ordered that Robert J. Shaw, Esquire, of Sigourney, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will adjourn at 2 o'clock until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Brimstone Railroad & Canal Company, Appellant,
240 vs.
The United States of America, Louisiana Western Railroad Company, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Wylie M. Barrow in that behalf, leave was granted to file a reply brief of the appellant.

Brimstone Railroad & Canal Company, Appellant,
240 vs.
The United States of America, Louisiana Western Railroad Company, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, by Mr. D. W. Knowlton for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. Wylie M. Barrow for the appellant.

Reba Fenwick,
Plaintiff in error,
13 vs.
Orel J. Myers, Prosecuting Attorney, Darke County, Ohio.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Mannix, Jr., and Mr. T. A. Billingsley for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Edward C. Turner for the defendant in error.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. George C. Bryant,
Plaintiff in error,
43 vs.
Charles F. Zimmerman, Chief of Police of Buffalo, New York, et al.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Connaughton and Mr. W. F. Zummbrunn for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Walter F. Hofheims, Mr. John H. Clogston, and Mr. Albert Ottinger for the defendants in error.

John P. Donnelley,
110 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry M. Hoyt and Mr. Frank H. Norcross for Donnelley, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Norman J. Morrisson for the United States.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
175 vs.
Ole Berkeness.

This case was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal..
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elwood P. Morey, It is ordered that Joseph R. Curl, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William C. Atwater & Company, Incorporated,
Appellant,
17 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Carroll Low for the appellant, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the appellee, with leave to appellant to file a brief within one week, on motion of Mr. George Maurice Morris, in that behalf.

Gong Lum and Chew How, next friends for Martha Lum,
Plaintiffs in error,
29 vs.
G. P. Rice, L. C. Brown, Henry McGowan, et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James N. Flowers for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Rush H. Knox and Mr. E. C. Sharp for the defendants in error.

Joseph E. Marron,
Petitioner,
185 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Hugh L. Smith for the petitioner, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Agustin Segurola and Manuel Santiago,
Petitioners,
195 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. E. B. Wilcox for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Rosario Gambino and Joseph Lima,
Petitioners,
226 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Irving K. Baxter for the petitioners, and continued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hampson Gary, It is ordered that Alexander Seaton Coke, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, It is ordered that P. J. Alexander, Esquire, of Smithville, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry B. Parris, It is ordered that Claude A. Miles, Esquire, of Checotah, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that John M. Gannon, Esquire, of Hibbing, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Jennie M. Blair, nee Adair,
Plaintiff in error,
32 vs.
Sam F. Wilkerson, Maude Schneider, individually and as Executrix, etc., et al.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Warrum, Mr. E. M. Frye, and Mr. C. L. Grant for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. A. Chase for the defendants in error.

Rosario Cambino and Joseph Lima,
Petitioners,
226 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Irving K. Baxter for the petitioners.

Millsaps College,
Plaintiff in error,
14 vs.
City of Jackson.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles Scott for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Garner W. Green and Mr. William H. Watkins for the defendant in error.

People of the State of New York, ex rel. International Bridge Company, Plaintiff in error,
16 vs.
State Tax Commission.

This case was argued by Mr. S. Fay Carr for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Herbert A. Hickman for the defendant in error.

Harry Hawkins, Charles Dawes, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
454 vs.
Elmer E. Klein, W. A. Moses, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles B. Cochran in that behalf, leave was granted to plaintiffs in error to file a statement of points to be relied upon and a designation of the parts of the record to be printed on or before November 1 next.

Thomas W. Phillips, Jr., et al., etc., substituted for Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, a corporation,

Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

The State of Oklahoma, The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles B. Cochran for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis VanDevanter
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Wallace, It is ordered that John Henry Lewin and Roger B. Williams, Esquires, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, It is ordered that John Francis Gough, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, John Francis Neylan and J. Paul Miller, Esquires, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion C. Early, It is ordered that Walter F. Boye, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore Rassieur, It is ordered that Julius T. Muench, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John H. Roche,

Plaintiff in error,

38 vs.

D. K. McDonald.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lucius G. Nash for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. C. Graves for the defendant in error.

Thomas W. Phillips, Jr., et al., substituted for Oklahoma Natural Gas Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

20 vs.

The State of Oklahoma, The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles B. Cochran for the plaintiffs in error, and concluded by Mr. E. S. Ratliff for the defendants in error.

No. 21. State of Missouri, ex rel. Washington University, plaintiff in error, v. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company,

No. 22. State of Missouri, ex rel. Washington University, plaintiff in error, v. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

No. 23. State of Missouri, ex rel. St. Louis Brewing Association, plaintiff in error, v. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company,

No. 24. State of Missouri, ex rel. St. Louis Brewing Association, plaintiff in error, v. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company,

No. 25. State of Missouri, ex rel. Wainright Real Estate Company, plaintiff in error, v. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company,

State of Missouri, ex rel. Wainright Real Estate Company,

Plaintiff in error,

26 vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles M. Polk in that behalf, leave was granted three counsel to present oral argument for the plaintiffs in error. These cases were argued by Mr. Charles M. Polk, Mr. Marion C. Early, and Mr. Charles

State of Missouri, ex rel. Hotel Statler Company, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
27 vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

Nagel for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Theodore Rassieur for the defendants in error.

H. C. Haas,
Plaintiff in error,
28 vs.
L. Greenwald and Walter W. Stevens.

This case was argued by Mr. Nathan William MacChesney for the defendants in error, and the case submitted by Mr. J. F. Sullivan for the plaintiff in error.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
31 vs.
Wheeling Can Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Joseph R. Curl for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondent.

Arthur C. Brown
33 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the United States, and the case submitted by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland and Mr. Robert N. Golding for Brown.

Equitable Trust Co. of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knauth, Nachod & Kuhne,
Petitioner,
34 vs.
Carl Rochling et al., trading as Gebrueder Rochling.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday / next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley, It is ordered that Dennis P. Quinlan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Beck, It is ordered that R. E. Rouer, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jacob M. Halper, It is ordered that Anna Judge Veters and S. Sanford Levy, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Sholes, It is ordered that Harry L. Crabtree, Esquire, of Ellsworth, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. West, It is ordered that Justin A. Altschul, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Henderson, It is ordered that Hugh Howell, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered Rawghlie C. Stanford, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Davis, It is ordered that J. Bayard Clark, Esquire, of Fayetteville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Elliot S. Benedict, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, It is ordered that Wilber M. Brucker, Esquire, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Charlotte W. Jones,

Petitioner,

390 vs.

The Counties Gas and Electric Company.

On consideration of the motion for judgment by default, in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

F. H. Fullwood,

Plaintiff in error,

370 vs.

City of Canton, Ohio, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. H. Fullwood,

Plaintiff in error,

370 vs.

City of Canton, Ohio, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

157 vs.

W. A. McFarland and J. Norris McFarland, Copartners, trading as Henry Marcus & Son.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

The decision of this case does not require a decision of the questions which are presented in the petition for certiorari because of which the writ was granted;

Therefore, It is now here ordered that the writ of certiorari heretofore granted in this cause be, and the same is hereby, revoked.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reba Fenwick,

Plaintiff in error,

13 vs. In error to the Supreme Court of the

Orel J. Myers, Prosecuting State of Ohio.

Attorney, Darke County, Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Star Motor Drivers, Association, The Blue Ribbon Auto Drivers Association of Michigan for the use, etc., Harry A. Dietz, et al., In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

Plaintiffs in error,

111 vs.

City of Detroit, James W. Inches, Commissioner of Police of the City of Detroit, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Mell Brooks and Blytheville
Special School District No. 5,
Plaintiffs in error,
88 vs.
Ralph Koonce, as State Treasurer
of the State of Arkansas.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Swift & Company, et al., and
Armour & Company, et al.,
181 vs.
The United States of America.

On certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

O R D E R

In accordance with section 251 of the Judicial Code, as existing prior to the act of February 13, 1925, c. 229, 43 Stat. 936,

It is ordered that the entire record in this cause be sent up to the Court so that the whole matter in controversey may be considered by the Court, and the cause is hereby set down for hearing on the first Tuesday of January next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern California Edison
Company, Petitioner,
188 vs.
Amelia Herminghaus, Bertha Genevieve
Bottoms, Victoria Pearl Womack,
et al., etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
283 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company, et al., etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Holland Furniture Company,
Petitioner,
285 vs.
Perkins Glue Company.

Order allowing Certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beatrice Grayson Johnson,
Petitioner,
297 vs.
Wright Thornburgh, as the Administrator of the Estate of Anna C. Thornburgh, deceased, Wright Thornburgh, by his guardian, etc., et al.

Order allowing Certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
299 vs.
Isadore N. Hellman.

Order allowing Certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
300 vs.
Milton C. Hellman.

Order allowing Certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in resppnse to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
321 vs.
Edgar M. Wright, as Guardian of Nettie T. Henderson, a minor.

Order allowing Certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles B. Brewer,
Petitioner,
282 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Neal, Inc., Edward G. Neale, Thomas M. Neale, et al., etc., et al., Petitioners,
284 vs.
Honorable Paul J. McCormick and Edward J. Henning, Judges, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Clear Vision Pump Company,
Petitioner,
286 vs.
The Wichita Visible Gasoline Pump Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the UnitedStates Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

287 vs.

Steamship "Harvey H. Brown", Castner Curran & Bullitt, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jack Cavana,

Petitioner,

289 vs.

Addison Miller, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
ex relatione Ellery C. Stowell,

Petitioner,

290 vs.

William C. Deming, George R. Wales, and Jessie Dell, Civil Service Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Business Men's Assurance Company of America,

Petitioner,

294 vs.

Dora A. Scott.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. George Wright, Superintendent Osage Agency, for and on behalf of Estate of Gilbert Cox, Osage Allottee, No. 139, deceased,

Petitioner,

295 vs.

C. E. Ashbrook, Legal Guardian of Catherine Cox, Johnson & Johnson, and Holcombe & Holden.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. A. Jeanneret,

Petitioner,

298 vs.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert L. Crook and Daniel H. Christman, Petitioners,

302 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul Villere, Trustee of the Estate of John P. Rausch Co., Inc., Bankrupts, Petitioner,

303 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mike Fritzel,

Petitioner,

305 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Rothstein,

Petitioner,

306 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, ex relatione
Clinton M. Searl,

Petitioner,

307 vs.

Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eugene K. Pape, by Elsie Wilson Pape, His guardian ad litem,

Petitioner,

308 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William L. Litzrodt,

Petitioner,

309 vs.

Thomas W. Miller, Alien Property Custodian and Frank White, Treasurer of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chester La Mare,

Petitioner,

310 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Mrs. Jessie B. Adkins, as Administratrix and individually, etc., et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

311

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arkansas Wholesale Grocers Association, Reynolds-Davis Grocery Company, Griffin Grocery Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Federal Trade Commission. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

312

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central National Bank Savings and Trust Company and Joseph A. Klein, Trustee, Petitioners, vs. The Murphy Hotels Corporation. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

313

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

Angola Transfer Company,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
The Texas & Pacific Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. A. Swanson,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert B. Armstrong and John M. Parker, Petitioners,
316 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar Day,
Petitioner,
317 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grace A. Leathe,
Petitioner,
318 vs.
Title Guaranty Trust Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexandria Paper Company,
Petitioner,
320 vs.
Eibel Process Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simon P. Lesselyoung, Petitioner,
323 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Otto C. Kurtz, Administrator of the Estate of Edward J. Call, deceased, Petitioner,
324 vs.
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners,
325 vs.
Red Jacket Consolidated Coal and Coke Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The International Organization of the United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Borderland Coal Corporation, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

326

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Alpha Pocahontas Coal Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

327

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Aetnae Sewell Smokeless Coal Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

328

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Dry Branch Coal Company, et al.

329

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Nelson Fuel Company, et al.

330

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Leevale Coal Company and Hopkins Fork Coal Company.

331

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Organization, United
Mine Workers of America, et al.,
Petitioners,
332 vs.
Seng Creek Coal Company and
Mordue Collieries Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Organization, United
Mine Workers of America, et al.,
Petitioners,
333 vs.
Raleigh-Wyoming Coal Company,
Hazy Eagle Collieries Company et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Organization, United
Mine Workers of America, et al.,
Petitioners,
334 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Sterling Block Coal Company, et al.

335 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Organization, United Mine Workers of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Carbon Fuel Company, et al.

336 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George T. Shaw, Petitioner, vs. C. A. Owens.

338 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of the Modern Workmen of the World and the Modern Workmen of the World Society, John B. Kinnear and Samuel J. Masters, Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. K. M. Norton for the petitioners.

Parimont Creamery Company,
725, October Term, 1926.
vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The motion to retax costs in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford L. Hilton for the defendant in error.

Lena Kahlstrom, as Administratrix of the Estate of Charles Kahlstrom, deceased, Petitioner,
527 vs.
International Stevedoring Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Joseph L. Tepper in that behalf, leave was granted the petitioner to file a reply brief on or before October 28th.

Arthur Rich,
Plaintiff in error,
543 vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilbur M. Brucker for the defendant in error.

Lena Kahlstrom, as Administratrix of the Estate of Charles Kahlstrom, deceased, Petitioner,
527 vs.
International Stevedoring Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur E. Griffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Stephen V. Carey and Mr. Alfred J. Schweppe for the respondent.

Francis J. McDonald,
Petitioner,
536 vs.
Albert T. Rosasco.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, Mr. Howard M. Long, and Mr. William J. Dean for the petitioner, and by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the respondent.

McCormick Intercoastal Steamship Company, claimant, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
540 vs.
Yamashita Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, claimant, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. H. Hayden and Mr. Lane Summers for the respondents.

Bachus-Brooks Company,
Petitioner,
541 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph Whelan, Mr. Thomas L. Philips, and Mr. John Junell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, Mr. Charles Bunn, and Mr. Edward S. Stringer for the respondents.

John D. Key, in his own behalf and as the guardian ad litem of Margaret Key et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
542 vs.
Panama Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey P. Fairman and Mr. Charles Kerr for the petitioners, and by Mr. John O. Collins for the respondent.

National Ben Franklin Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
546 vs.
William M. Filkins, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of U. S. Pulp Products Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abner Siegal for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry E. Newell for the respondent.

The Yorkshire Insurance Company, Limited, Petitioner,
547 vs.
William M. Filkins, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of U. S. Pulp Products Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abner Siegal for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry E. Newell for the respondent.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company, Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Foye M. Murphy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Old Colony Trust Company et al., executors, Petitioners,
553 vs.
John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Walker Taylor, Mr. Frank W. Grinnell, Mr. George L. Shearer, and Mr. Robert C. Shelley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondents.

Elizabeth C. Taft,
Petitioner,
554 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry W. Taft for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Gilbert C. Greenway, Jr.,
Petitioner,
575 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger S. Baldwin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

United States, use of Union Gas Engine Company,
Petitioner,
378 vs.
Newport Shipbuilding Corporation, Limited, National Surety Company.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari has been filed in this cause by counsel for petitioner,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Weldon J. Bailey,
Petitioner,
381 vs.
The State of Arizona.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition, be and the same is hereby, dismissed for failure to comply with the rules.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. Berry,
Plaintiff in error,
578 vs.
C. A. Bates, Amy A. Bates, Flora E. Henshaw, et al.

In error to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lulu Mignon Murphy,
Petitioner,
586 vs.
Eugenie R. Bird, Administratrix of the Estate of Dan W. Bird, S. S. Murphy, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Lulu Mignon Murphy, pro se.

Equitable Trust Co. of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knauth, Nachod & Kuhne, Petitioner,

34 vs.

Carl Rochling, et al., trading as Gebrueder Rochling.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry G. Hotchkiss for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner.

Bloecher & Schaaf, Inc., Howard Browning, George R. Ebhardt, et al., Plaintiffs in error,

35 vs.

Mayor and City Council of Baltimore and Hampson Jones, Commissioner of Health.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Emory H. Niles for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner,

36 vs.

The State of Texas.

This case was argued by Mr. A. H. McKnight for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. W. Bailey and Mr. Luther Nickels for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Morgan, It is ordered that Cleon Headley and Warren S. Carter, Esquires, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Boyd, It is ordered that William J. Doyle, Jr., Esquire of Canenovia, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Riordon, It is ordered that C. Russell Riordon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abram F. Myers, It is ordered that Richard B. McCulloch, Esquire, of Marianna, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran, It is ordered that Charles Clarke Cooper, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Rigby, It is ordered that Miguel Romualdez, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cordell Hull, It is ordered that Harry Friedman and W. D. Jamieson, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arshur M. Free, It is ordered that Robert Douglas Duke, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lindley H. Hadley, It is ordered that Otto W. Heider, Esquire, of Sheridan, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Cobb Brick Company,

Plaintiff in error,

47 vs.

Clara C. Lindsay.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Thompson, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Gillis A. Johnson for the defendant in error.

J. Smylie Herkness,
Appellant,
50 vs.
Valentine K. Irion, Commissioner of Conservation of the State of Louisiana, and Percy Saint, Attorney General of the State of Louisiana.

This case was continued per stipulation of counsel.

The Temco Electric Motor Company,
Petitioner,
37 vs.
Apco Manufacturing Company.

This case was argued by Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., and Mr. H. A. Toulmin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clifford L. Anderson for the respondent.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
39 vs.
W. F. Wells.

This case was argued by Mr. Ellis B. Cooper for the petitioner, and the case submitted by Mr. W. Calvin Wells for the respondent.

B. A. Marlin,
Petitioner,
40 vs.
John Lewallen and Lucy Condren.

This case was argued by Mr. Claude A. Niles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry B. Parris for the respondents.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
41 vs.
Ida May Southwell, Administratrix of H. J. Southwell.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Bayard Clark for the respondent.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
42 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the respondent, and the case submitted for the petitioner by Mr. W. F. Williamson, Mr. B. M. Aikins, and Mr. Barry Mohun, with leave to petitioner to file a reply brief hereafter, on motion of Mr. Richard W. Shands, in that behalf.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1927 .

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Reynolds, It is ordered that H. C. Brodie, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Dunbar-Dukate Company, Incorporated,
Plaintiff in error,
44 vs.
The Celeste Sugar Company, Incorporated.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. George E. Strong, leave was granted the defendant in error to file an opposition to the motion to abate or substitute, on or before October 28 next.

C. J. Longest,
Petitioner,
52 vs.
W. C. Langford and G. N. Puckett.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Ledbetter for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. R. Bowen and Mr. W. F. Semple for the respondent.

Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
53 vs.
Mrs. Olena Moser, Administratrix.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Terry, and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. L. Curtis for the respondent.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
42 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the respondent.

R. C. Breen, Phoebe Wiseman, D. S. Ringrey, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
45 vs.
Morton Denison Hull, William E. Boeing, Caroline Boeing Poole.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. V. Mercer for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Thomas H. Dent, as Administrator of Elmira Holland, deceased, Plaintiff in error,
46 vs.
James S. Swilley.

This case was argued by Mr. William L. Houston for the plaintiff in error, and the case submitted by Mr. Thomas B. Dupree for the defendant in error.

Alexander Latzko, William Latzko, Charles Latzko, et al., etc., Petitioners,
48 vs.
Equitable Trust Company of New York, Trustee in Bankruptcy,
Equitable Trust Company of New York, Trustee in Bankruptcy, Petitioner,
49 vs.
Alexander Latzko, William Latzko, Charles Latzko, et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. Charles A. Brodek for Alexander Latzko, et al., and by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the Equitable Trust Company of New York, Trustee in Bankruptcy

A. W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President, Petitioner,

54 vs.

L. E. McKinley.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Ashby M. Warren for the petitioner.

-roclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Eggers, It is ordered that Robert N. Brumbaugh, Ishur L. Jacobson, Albertus McL. Marshall, and Byron B. Harlan, Esquires, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Bachrach, It is ordered that Walter H. Moses, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman B. Landreau, It is ordered that Charles E. A. Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and H. P. Viering, Esquire, of Gretna, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Davenport, It is ordered that Charles Fairhurst, Esquire, of Greenfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, It is ordered that John A. Sibley, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will adjourn at 2 p.m. to-morrow.

A. W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President, Petitioner,
54 vs.
L. E. McKinley.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Ashby M. Warren for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, John J. Blaine, as Governor of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants,
55 vs.
Chicago and North Western Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a motion has been filed by counsel for the appellants to dismiss the appeal in this cause:

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Produits Metallurgiques Anciens Etablissements Meiboom & Cie, Societe Anonyme, Petitioner,
56 vs.
Gulf Export & Transportation Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and the petitioners having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute their writ of certiorari, and failing to appear, It is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 19th rule of this Court, and on the motion of Mr. E. Curtis Rouse, of counsel for the respondent, now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, Petitioner,
57 vs.
Wells-Dickey Trust Company, Special Administrator of the Estate of Elmer E. Anderson, deceased.

This case was argued by Mr. J. C. James for the petitioner, and the case submitted by Mr. F. M. Miner and Mr. Robert J. McDonald for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
58 vs.
Dora Goodman, Administratrix of the Estate of Nathan Goodman, deceased.

This case was argued by Mr. A. McL. Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert N. Brumbaugh for the respondent. On motion of Mr. R. N. Brumbaugh leave was granted to file a brief for the respondent hereafter.

George D. Iverson, Jr.,
Plaintiff in error,
59 vs.
Illinois Glass Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harry Zoller, Jr., for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Ben W. Steele, Executor of Estate of A. B. Steele, deceased,
Petitioner,
60 vs.
J. H. Drummond.

This case was argued by Mr. John A. Sibley for the respondent, and the case submitted by Mr. William D. Thompson and Mr. Harold Hirsch for the petitioner.

Mueller Grain Company,
Petitioner,
61 vs.
American State Bank of Omaha, Nebraska.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Walter H. Moses, leave was granted petitioner to file a reply brief on or before October 27 next. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Walter H. Moses for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milus A. Nisbet, It is ordered that Davidson L. Southard, Esquire, of Palm Beach, State of Florida, and Frank T. Pancher, Esquire, of West Palm Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Percy S. Bryant, It is ordered that William J. Malone, Esquire, of Bristol, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer, It is ordered that Frank Collis Bowers, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Swagar Sherley, It is ordered that Gardner K. Byers, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde B. Aitchison, It is ordered that David J. A. Hayes, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Fairhurst, It is ordered that James P. Doran, Esquire, of New Bedford, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Doyle, It is ordered that E. Paul Yaselli, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lindley H. Hadley, It is ordered that R. W. Huntoon, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mueller Grain Company,
Petitioner,
61 vs.
American State Bank of Omaha,
Nebraska.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Walter H. Moses for the petitioner, and the case submitted by Mr. Carl Meyer, Mr. Henry Russell Platt, and Mr. David F. Rosenthal for the respondent.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1927 - CONTINUED.

John A. Grosfield and Richard Caplis, 62 vs. The United States of America.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harold Goodman for Grosfield and Caplis, and continued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 O'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hampson Gary, It is ordered that Edward C. Holden, Jr., Esquire, of Lynn, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Wainneright, It is ordered that Nelson Duvall Brecht, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dallas S. Townsend, It is ordered that Henry Walton Proffitt, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene R. West, It is ordered that Ralph G. Albrecht, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter Q. Nyce. It is ordered that Cornelius D. Murane, Esquire, of Casper, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Camden R. McAtee, It is ordered that S. Leo Ruslander, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

T. H. Smallwood, W. F. Smallwood,
A. D. Smallwood, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
211 vs.
Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer of
Porto Rico.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed without costs to either party; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, with directions to dismiss the bill for the want of jurisdiction, and to return any money deposited in Court for payment of taxes in case of adverse decision.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes,

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Adolfo Valdes Ordonez, Salvador Garcia, Victor Ochoa, et al., etc., Petitioners,

212 vs.

Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs to either party; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, with directions to dismiss the bill for the want of jurisdiction, and to return any money deposited in Court for payment of taxes in case of adverse decision.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Insular Motor Corporation, Petitioner,

213 vs.

Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs to either party; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, with directions to dismiss the bill for the want of jurisdiction, and to return any money deposited in Court for payment of taxes in case of adverse decision.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this

Adolfo Valdes, Pio Perez, Luis C. Cuyar, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

214

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs to either party; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, with directions to dismiss the bill for the want of jurisdiction, and to return any money deposited in Court for payment of taxes in case of adverse decision.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Finlay, Waymouth & Lee, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

215

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs to either party; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, with directions to dismiss the bill for the want of jurisdiction, and to return any money deposited in Court for payment of taxes in case of adverse decision.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this

Angel Abarca Portilla, Rafael Abarca Portilla, Enrique Abarca Sanfeliz, et al., etc., Petitioners,

216 vs.

Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs to either party; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, with directions to dismiss the bill for the want of jurisdiction, and to return any money deposited in Court for payment of taxes in case of adverse decision.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes,

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Juan C. Gallardo, Appellant,

164 vs.

Santini Fertilizer Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, transferred from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit under the Act of September 14, 1922.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed without costs to either party; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico with directions to dismiss the bill for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1927 - CONTINUED.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Dunbar Dukate Company, Incorporated
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The Celeste Sugar Company,
Incorporated.

On consideration of the motion to substitute parties defendant in error in this cause, It is now here ordered that the motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, for the reason that the absence of a substantial federal question requires the Court to grant the motion to dismiss.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dunbar-Dukate Company, Incorporated,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
The Celeste Sugar Company,
Incorporated.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to abate or dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In the Matter of
The Modern Workmen of the World and the Modern Workmen of the World Society, John B. Kinnear and Samuel J. Masters,
Petitioners,
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Rich,

Plaintiff in error,

543 vs.

The People of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lulu Mignon Murphy,

Petitioner,

586 vs.

Eugenie R. Bird, Administratrix of the Estate of Dan W. Bird, S. S. Murphy, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lulu Mignon Murphy,

Petitioner,

586 vs.

Eugenie R. Bird, Administratrix of the Estate of Dan W. Bird, S.S. Murphy, et al.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John P. Donnelley,
110 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered that this cause be restored for reargument. It is further ordered that the entire record in this cause be certified up to the Court in accordance with section 239 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the Act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 936), so that the whole matter in controversy may be considered by the Court, and the case is hereby set down for hearing on the 21st day of November next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jennie M. Blair, nee Adair,
Plaintiff in error,
32 vs.
Sam F. Wilkerson, Maud Schneider, individually and as Executrix, etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jennie M. Blair, nee Adair,
Petitioner,
32 vs.
Sam F. Wilkerson, Maud Schneider, individually and as Executrix, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

People of the State of New York
ex rel. International Bridge Company, Plaintiff in error,
16 vs.
State Tax Commission.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas W. Phillips, Jr., et al., etc., substituted for Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, a corporation, Plaintiff in error,
20 vs.
The State of Oklahoma, The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, Shawnee Gas & Electric Company, a corporation.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas W. Phillips, Jr., et al., etc., substituted for Oklahoma Natural Gas Company, a corporation, Petitioner, vs. The State of Oklahoma, The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, Shawnee Gas & Electric Company, a corporation, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

20

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, ex rel. Washington University, Plaintiff in error, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

21

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, ex rel. Washington University, Petitioner, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

21

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri ex rel. Washington University,
Plaintiff in error,
22 vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Light and Power Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri ex rel. Washington University,
Petitioner,
22 vs.
Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Light and Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri ex rel. St. Louis
Brewing Association,
Plaintiff in error,
23 vs.
Public Service Commission of
Missouri and Union Electric Light
& Power Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri ex rel. St. Louis
Brewing Association,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
Public Service Commission of
Missouri and Union Electric Light
and Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri ex rel. St. Louis Brewing Association,

Plaintiff in error,

vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

24

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri ex rel., St. Louis Brewing Association,

Petitioner,

vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light and Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

24

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, ex rel.
Wainwright Real Estate Company,
Plaintiff in error,
25 vs.
Public Service Commission of
Missouri and Union Electric Light
& Power Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, ex rel.
Wainwright Real Estate Company,
Petitioner,
25 vs.
Public Service Commission of
Missouri and Union Electric Light
& Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, ex rel.
Wainright Real Estate Company,
Plaintiff in error,
26 vs.
Public Service Commission of
Missouri and Union Electric Light
and Power Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, ex rel.
Wainright Real Estate Company,
Petitioner,
26 vs.
Public Service Commission of
Missouri and Union Electric Light
& Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, ex rel. Hotel Statler Company, Inc.,

Plaintiff in error,

27 vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light & Power Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, ex rel. Hotel Statler Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

27 vs.

Public Service Commission of Missouri and Union Electric Light and Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. C. Haas,

Plaintiff in error,

28 vs.

L. Greenwald and Walter W. Stevens.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

New York Central Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

31 vs.

Wheeling Can Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur C. Brown,

33 vs.

The United States of America.

It is ordered that, in accordance with section 239 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the act of February 13, 1925 (c. 229, 43 Stat. 936), the entire record in this cause be certified up to the Court so that the whole matter in controversy may be considered by the Court, and this cause is hereby set down for hearing on the first Tuesday of January next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bloetcher & Schaaf, Inc., Howard Browning, George R. Ebhardt, et al.,

Plaintiff in error,

35 vs.

Mayor and City Council of Baltimore and Hampson Jones, Commissioner of Health.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cobb Brick Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Civil Appeals,

47 vs. Third Supreme Judicial District of

Clara C. Lindsay. the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated, without costs to either party, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, with directions for further proceedings in the light of the decision of the Supreme Court of Texas in Magnolia Petroleum Company vs. Hamilton, 283 S. W. 475, and of the decisions of this Court in Missouri ex rel. Wabash Railway Company vs. Public Service Commission, 273 U. S. 126; Dorchy vs. Kansas, 264 U. S. 286; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company vs. Dennis, 224 U. S. 503.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. C. Breen, Phoebe Wiseman,

D. S. Ringrey, et al.,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

45 vs. State of Minnesota.

Morton Denison Hull, William E.

Boeing, Caroline Boeing Poole,

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Thomas H. Dent, as Administrator of Elmira Holland, deceased,
Plaintiff in error,
46 vs.
James S. Swilley.

In error to the Court of Civil Appeals, Ninth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Ninth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas H. Dent, as Administrator of Elmira Holland, deceased,
Petitioner,
46 vs.
James S. Swilley.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Ninth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Ninth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
L. E. McKinley.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

The grounds which were presented in the petition for a writ of certiorari, because of which the writ was granted, do not prove to have a substantial basis in the record,

It is therefore ordered that the writ of certiorari heretofore granted in this case be, and the same is hereby, vacated.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Iverson, Jr.,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Appeals of

59 vs. the State of Maryland.

Illinois Glass Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Iverson, Jr., On petition for writ of Certiorari

Plaintiff in error, to the Court of Appeals of the State

59 vs. of Maryland.

Illinois Glass Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mueller Grain Company,

Petitioner, On writ of Certiorari to the United

61 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

American State Bank of Omaha, the Seventh Circuit.

Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. Grosfield and Richard Caplis,

62 vs.

The United States of America.

O R D E R

It is ordered by the Court that the entire record in this cause be certified up to the Court in accordance with section 239 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 936), so that the whole matter in controversy may be considered by the Court, and the cause is hereby set down for hearing on the first Tuesday of January next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company, Petitioner,

342 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. And it is further ordered that the argument be limited to the question of practice in respect to the bill of exceptions upon which the case in the Circuit Court of Appeals was made to turn.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Finkelstein & Kommel, Petitioners,

346 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. And it is further ordered that the case be set for hearing on November 21st next after the cases heretofore set for that date.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner,
341 vs.
James R. Tindle, and The Union Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Co-executors, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner.
344 vs.
Robert L. Braffet, Administrator of the Estate of Mark P. Braffet, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
349 vs.
Franklin Jones, Administrator of the Estate of D. R. Ferguson, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Midland Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
Thomas Barkley, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John J. Mitchell, Augustine L. Humes and Illinois Merchants Trust Company, as Executors,
Petitioners,
376 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Howard Moore,
Petitioner,
384 vs.
The City of Nampa.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minnie E. Patterson, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits of William V. Patterson, deceased, Petitioner,

339 vs.

New York Central Railroad Company, sued as New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Erwin Brown, Petitioner,

340 vs.

Pere Marquette Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank Dane, Petitioner,

345 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Lawrence Mills and John R. Gray,
Petitioners,
348 vs.
Charles T. Sherman, First Trust and Savings Bank, a Corporation, and Louis Boisot, et al., Trustees.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ritchie L. Dunn, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of John Rothschild, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
350 vs.
Shell Company of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Wescott Stearn, R. W. Warren, and S. T. Kent Oliver,
Petitioners,
353 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guillermo Severino and Petra Absalon, Petitioners,
354 vs.
El Hogar Filipino, Sociedad Mutua de Construccion y Prestamos.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gervasio Miraflores and Jose Miraflores, Petitioners,
355 vs.
El Hogar Filipino, Sociedad Mutua de Construccion y Prestamos.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph S. Williams, Charles M. Boyd, Frank M. Eschleman, et al., Petitioners,
356 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Gulf and Ship Island Railroad Company, Petitioner,
357 vs.
Mrs. Rubie Curtis, Administratrix of the Estate of George D. Curtis, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. L. Brown, Administrator of W. E. Brown, deceased, Petitioner,
358 vs.
Norfolk and Western Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Emery and Insurance Company of North America, Petitioner,
359 vs.
Ove Lange, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
360 vs.
Juan G. Callardo, Treasurer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. T. Irwin, Sherman & Ellis, Inc.,
Heco Envelope Co., et al.,
Petitioner,
361 vs.
The Missouri Valley Bridge & Iron Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy,
Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
362 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner,
363 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of Illinois and Oscar E. Carlstrom, as Attorney General of the State of Illinois and John C. Fisher, et al., Petitioners,
367 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company and Southern Illinois and Kentucky Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Aetna Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut, Petitioner,
368 vs.
Licking Valley Milling Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George E. Truman, as County Treasurer of Pinal County, Arizona, J. C. Callaghan, as Treasurer of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioners, vs. Walter J. Thalheimer, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Florence Commercial Company, Bankrupt.

369 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Lighterage Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Ernest Soderberg, managing owner of the barge "Alert", and Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd.

371 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, andof the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William McCully, Petitioner, vs. Monongahela Railroad Company.

372 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

Franklin County, Arkansas,
Petitioner,
373 vs.
Harriman National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Franklin County, Arkansas,
Petitioner,
374 vs.
Sullivan County National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. B. Siegel, Inc.,
Petitioner,
377 vs.
City of Chicago.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Monty Morris,
Petitioner,
379 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company,
Petitioner,
380 vs.
Carl F. Leverentz, Administrator of the Estate of Carl Edward Leverentz, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
382 vs.
Del Kalbaugh and James Moxley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Graff Furnace Company,

Petitioner,

385 vs.

Hans Machler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order.

O R D E R

The Court authorizes the Clerk to charge off on his books in certain cases reported by him as uncollectable costs amounting to $2296.96, covering the period from the October Term, 1913, to the October Term, 1925, in accordance with a list attached, without, however, interfering in any way with the force and validity of the charges therein contained, if collection thereafter proves to be possible.

October Term, 1913		Amount.
No. 752	Charleston etc. Ry. Co. vs. Thompson	$ 3.35
776	Star Chronicle Pub. Co. vs. United Press Ass'n.	1.00
798	Oceanic Steam Nav. Co. etc. vs. Mellon.	6.75
838	United States vs. Foster.	10.10
966	Roller vs. Murray.	3.10
		$24.30

October Term, 1914.		
No. 43	Southwestern Telegraph & Tel. Co. vs. Danaher.	17.05
86	Guffey vs. Smith	12.05
87	Guffey vs. Smith	12.05
96	Frank Guinn et al. vs. United States.	7.00
150	McGowan vs. Parish	7.85
157	Kreitlein vs. Ferger	8.85
213	Hartford Life Ins. Co. vs. Ibs	17.00

October Term, 1914 - Continued.			Amount
No.	286	Brown vs. Fletcher	$16.05
	454	Brown vs. Fletcher	13.60
	455	Provident Life & Trust Co. vs. Fletcher	13.60
	516	Norfolk & Western Ry. Co. vs. Holbrook	17.00
	676	McDougal vs. McKay	7.00
	685	Morgan, Warden etc. vs. Devine	(87.55 (8.85
	713	Seaboard Air Line Ry. vs. Tilghman	15.25
	813	Newman vs. U. S. ex rel. Frizzell	19.35
	1028	McArthur vs. Citizens Bank of Norfolk	1.05
		Total	$281.15

October Term, 1915.			
No.	38	Glenwood Light etc. Co. vs. Mut. Light etc. Co.	7.85
	133	Northern Pac Ry. Co. vs. Meese.	9.35
	196	Gr. Northern Ry. Co. vs. Wiles	8.35
	201	Southern Exp. Co. vs. Byers.	2.85
	245	Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. vs. Hostetter	8.35
	274	Ches. & Ohio Ry. Co. vs. DeAtley	9.35
	321	Ches. & Ohio Ry. Co. vs. Kelly	10.60
	347	Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe. Ry. Co. vs. Harold.	9.85
	355	Southern Ry. Co. vs. Gray.	9.10
	358	Southern Ry. Co. vs. Prescott	14.75
	453	C. & O. Ry. Co. vs. Gainey, Jr.	10.25
	485	L. & N. R. R. Co. vs. Stewart	5.85
	486	C., R. I & P. Ry. Co. vs. Bond, Adm'r.	16.00
	492	K. C. Sou. Ry. Co. vs. Jones, Adm'x.	10.50
	613	Pecos & Northern Tex. Ry. Co. vs. Rosenbloom	15.75
	923	Moulden vs. Parlin & Orendorff Implement Co.	.30
		Total	$149.05

October Term, 1916.			
	25	Original. Ex parte: Indiana Transportation Co.	7.65
	8	Sim vs. Edenborn	17.00
	9	Alder vs. Edenborn	12.75
	31	Southern Ry. etc. vs. Driggs	7.60
	32	Southern Ry. Co. etc. vs. Driggs	7.60
	60	Goshen Mfg. Co. vs. Myers Mfg. Co.	7.60

October Term, 1916-Continued.

			Amount
No.	452	United States vs. Merchants & Mfgrs. Traffic Ass'n.	$ 7.85
	472	Saunders vs. Shaw	9.50
	631	B. & O. R. R. Co. vs. Branson	18.25
		Total	$95.80

October Term, 1917.

No.	20	Cisana vs. Tennessee	19.05
	89	Stellwagen vs. Clum	9.60
	167	Roller vs. Armentrout	2.10
	168	Marconi Wireless Tel. Co. vs. Simon	19.75
	227	Marin vs. Augedahl	8.60
	252) 253)	Hartford Life Ins. Co. vs. Barber	26.50
	276	New Orleans & N. E. R. R. Co. et al. vs. Harris	8.35
	419) 429)	Noble, President vs. W. U. Tel. Co. Nobel, President vs. United Tel. Co.	20.70
		Total	$114.65

October Term, 1918

No.	10	Original. South Dakota vs. Collins.	3.15
	134	New York Central R. R. Co. vs. Porter	10.10
	235	United States vs. Comyns	8.85
	242	New Orleans & N. E. R. R. Co. vs. Scarlet	14.05
	254	Parker vs. Riley	8.80
	283	Chalker vs. Birmingham & N. W. Ry. Co.	8.60
	313	Parker vs. Richard	10.35
	563	Parker vs. Richard	- 2.60
		Total	$66.50

October Term, 1919

No.	83	W. U. Tel. Co. vs. Boegli	11.60
	86	Houston, Secy. , etc. vs. Ormes	14.25
	150	Lee vs. Central of Georgia Ry. Co.	46.45
	193	Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co. vs. Gray	15.70
	224	Ward vs. Board of County Comm'rs. etc.	14.25
	289	Broadwell vs. Board of County Comm'rs. etc.	15.50
	415	Phil. & Reading Ry. Co. vs. Hancock	16.35

			Amount
October Term, 1920.			
No. 16	Harris vs. District of Columbia		$ 15.60
26	Pryor vs. Williams		7.85
57	Postal Tel. etc. Co. vs. Dickerson		8.85
85	Haupt vs. United States.		13.60
100	Galveston H. & S. A. Ry. Co. vs. Woodbury.		8.55
188	Anchor Oil Co. vs. Gray		17.85
191	McHenry vs. Bankers Trust Co.		121.10
238	Bank of Minden vs. Clement.		9.75
252	Missouri Pac. R. R. Co. vs. Ault		9.70
274	Supreme Tribe of Ben Hur vs. Cauble		8.10
286	New York Trust Co. et al. vs. Eisner(costs of Wendell Comptroller as amicus curiae)		8.40
298	Phil. & Reading Ry. Co. vs. Polk.		13.80
800	Pierce vs. Dahlgren		17.60
		Total	$260.75

October Term, 1921.			
No. 25	Rennie vs. Gibson		3.25
55	Alabama etc. Ry. Co. vs. Journey		9.20
28	Western Fuel Co. vs. Garcia, Adm.		22.25
136	First National Bank of Gulfport vs. Adams.		7.35
142	Rafferty vs. Wisayan Refining Co.		6.01
164	United Zinc etc. Co. vs. Britt		8.60
582	United States vs. Behrman		7.10
3	Original. Wyoming vs. Colorado. Costs of two corporate defendants. Laramie Poudre Irrigation Co. $532.68; Greely-Poudre Irrigation District 532.67		1,065.35
		Total	$1,129.11

October Term, 1922			
404	McCarthy, Marshal vs. Armstein		21.35

October Term, 1925.			
264	St. Louis, San Fran, Ry. Co. vs. Mills.		7.60
807	Barker vs. United States.		12.60
			$ 20.20

SUMMARY OF COSTS DEEMED UNCOLLECTIBLE.

October Term, 1913	$ 24.30
October Term, 1914	281.15
October Term, 1915	149.05
October Term, 1916	95.80
October Term, 1917	114.65
October Term, 1918	66.50
October Term, 1919	134.10
October Term, 1920	260.75
October Term, 1921	1129.11
October Term, 1922	21.35
October Term, 1925	20.20
	$2296.96

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

O R D E R

The Clerk is authorized to pay to the city of New Orleans balances of deposits for costs in certain cases amounting in all to $2221.86, as shown by the list attached to this order, in order that the cases my be finally settled.

BALANCES OF DEPOSITS FOR COSTS DUE THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS.

Nos. 282, 283, 284, October Term, 1884

City of New Orleans vs. Hart $250.00

No. 7, October Term, 1886.

City of New Orleans vs. State of Lousiana ex rel Shepherd 2.22

No. 54, October Term, 1886.

City of New Orleans vs. Huston 16.90

No. 4, October Term, 1888.

City of New Orleans vs. Christmas & Whitney, Admr. of Baines 1952.74

Total $2221.86

O R D E R

The Court will take a recess from Monday, October 31st until Monday November 21st, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rupert Ribnik,
Plaintiff in error,
569 vs.
Andrew F. McBride, Commissioner of Labor of the State of New Jersey.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Davenport in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas,
Petitioner,
42 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. William C. Rigby, leave was granted the respondent to file a supplemental brief in this case.

John Lapique, Successor in interest of the Estate of Maria Espiritu Chiljulla De Leonis, etc.,
Appellant,
158 vs.
Frank E. Walsh, Administrator, etc., Harry L. Dunnigan, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Reid for the petitioner.

No. 407. H. F. Perry, plaintiff in error, vs. Alice M. Ramsey, C. L. King, and L. D. Haldey.

No. 408. C. L. Harris, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of T. A. Kramer, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Alice M. Ramsey, C. L. King, H. F. Perry, et al.

No. 409. H. F. Perry, plaintiff in error, vs. W. O. James, C. L. King, and L. D. Hadley.

No. 410. C. L. Harris, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of T. A. Kramer, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. W. O. James, C. L. King, H. F. Ferry, et al.

No. 411. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. Ramsey Petroleum Company, C. L. King, L. D. Hadley, et al.

No. 412. C. L. Harris, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of T. A. Kramer, plaintiff in error, vs. Ramsey Petroleum Company, C. L. King, L. D. Haldey, et al.

No. 413. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. G. L. Ramsey, C. L. King, et al.

No. 414. C. L. Harris, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of T. A. Kramer, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. G. L. Ramsey, C. L. King, H. F. Ferry, et al.

No. 415. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. M. R. Chastain, C. L. King, L. D. Hadley, et al.

No. 416. C. L. Harris, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of T. A. Kramer, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. M. R. Chastain, C. L. King, L. D. Hadley, et al.

No. 417. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. A. L. Lloyd, C. L. King, and L. D. Hadley.

C. L. Harris, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of T. A. Kramer, deceased, Plaintiff in error,
418 vs.
A. L. Lloyd, C. L. King, and H. F. Ferry, et al.

The motion to consolidate and as to the printing of these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Strong for the plaintiffs in error.

Chimney Rock Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
461 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Central Union Trust Company of New York, Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Frederic A. Julliard, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
483 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Perry and Mr. John W. Drye, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Tucker Barnett and Wysey Winn,
Petitioners,
550 vs.
Prairie Oil & Gas Company, W. A. Kunkle, Hannah Bird, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. A. Davidson and Mr. T. J. Flannelly for the respondents.

Garfield A. Street,
Petitioner,
556 vs.
Emily M. Stubblefield and Emily M. Stubblefield, Executrix, Estate of Thomas W. Stubblefield.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Merillat for the petitioner and by Mr. C. A. Brandenburg, Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, and Mr. Louis M. Denit for the respondents.

Arthur L. Bisbee, Frank J. Bisbee, Edgar C. Bisbee,
Petitioners,
557 vs.
Midland Linseed Products Company, E. C. Warner Company, Grain Securities Company, Ltd., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. V. Mercer for the petitioners, and by Mr. John Junell for the respondents.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as the Royal Administration of the Swedish State Railways,

Petitioner,

558 vs.

The National City Bank of New York and Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as the Royal Administration of the Swedish State Railways,

Petitioner,

559 vs.

Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gustav Lange, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Haight and Mr. John A. Garver for the respondents.

Auto Motive Equipment Company and Gilfillan Bros., Inc.,

Petitioners,

560 vs.

The Connecticut Telephone & Electric Company, Incorporated.

George H. Mitchell for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wylie C. Margeson and Mr. William H. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr.

Leon Kanner, Joseph Kanner, and Max Kanner, Petitioners,

562 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon Kanner, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Otis Elevator Company,
Petitioner,
563 vs.
Lois Hoskins and Hotel Randolph Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin W. Sims, Mr. Elwood G. Godman, and Mr. James L. Coleman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Donald Evans, Mr. Clifford V. Cox, and Mr. Wm. F. Riley for the respondents

Nathan Bard,
Petitioner,
565 vs.
John B. Chilton, Warden, Kentucky State Penitentiary, Herbert Woodruff, Sheriff of Hopkins County, etc., et al.
Bunyan Fleming,
Petitioner,
566 vs.
John B. Chilton, Warden, Kentucky State Penitentiary, Herbert Woodruff, Sheriff of Hopkins County, etc., et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sinclair Merrell Russell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Andrew T. Smith for the respondents.

Theodore Davis Boal, as Executor of the will of Annie B. Davis, deceased, and Kate Atwood, Individually, etc.,
Petitioners,
567 vs.
Metropolitan Museum of Art of the City of New York and the Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, as Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tompkins McIlvaine, Mr. Lyman K. Clark, and Mr. William E. Carnochan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert Thorne, Mr. William R. Tillinghast, and Mr. James C. Collins for the respondents.

Jacob Marcus and Benjamin Marcus
Petitioners,
570 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lowrie C. Barton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Gypsy Oil Company,
Petitioner,
572 vs.
Leo Bennett Escoe, a Minor, by O. W. Stephens, Guardian, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the petitioner, and by Mr. Creekmore Wallace for the respondents.

Ray C. Simmons,
Petitioner,
65 vs.
Edward P. Swan.

This case was argued by Mr. William J. Malone and Mr. Percy S. Bryant for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Fairhurst for the respondent.

The State of Washington, on the relation of Stimson Timber Company,
Plaintiff in error,
66 vs.
E. V. Kuykendall (John C. Denny, substituted) as Director of Public Works of the State of Washington, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. C. A. Reynolds for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. H. C. Brodie for the defendants in error.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1927 - CONTINUED.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
63 vs.
R. E. Ellzey.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. F. H. Moore for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT;

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hamilton, It is ordered that Bert Lawton, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, It is ordered that Abraham J. Levin, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Jones, It is ordered that Lawrence Walton Morris, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clare B. Tinkham, It is ordered that Gerald A. Gillett, Esquire, of Hammond, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. Hardy Todd, It is ordered that George L. Badder, Esquire, of Highland Park, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Kearns, It is ordered that Lester L. Bauer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
63 vs.
R. E. Ellzey.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. C. N. Lewis for the petitioner.

Kinney-Coastal Oil Company and Texas Production Company Petitioners,
64 vs.
Michael F. Kieffer, Orpha M. Kieffer, Herbert L. Leaming, et al., etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward M. Freeman for the petitioners, and by Mr. C. S. Murane for the respondents.

City of Hammond, Petitioner,
67 vs.
Schappi Bus Line, Inc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. C. B. Tinkham for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. William J. Whinery for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that John J. D. Preston, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran, It is ordered that Paul J. Sedgwick, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Spilman, It is ordered that F. M. Livezey, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James J. O'Leary, It is ordered that Elmer Haslett, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as agent designated by the President, etc., Plaintiff in error,
74 vs.
Thomas E. O'Neil.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifton P. Williamson and Mr. Herbert S. Ogden for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Nathan Ballin for the defendant in error.

City of Hammond, Petitioner,
67 vs.
Schappi Bus Line, Inc.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. William J. Whinery for the respondent.

City of Hammond, Petitioner,
68 vs.
Farina Bus Line and Transportation Company.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis T. Michener, Mr. C. B. Tinkham, and Mr. Gerald Gillett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse J. Ricks and Mr. Edmond W. Hebel for the respondent.

Mercantile Trust Company of St. Louis, Missouri,
69 vs. Petitioner,
Wilmot Road District.

This case was argued by Mr. George B. Rose for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert E. Wiley for the respondent.

Louisville Gas & Electric Company, Plaintiff in error,
70 vs.
W. H. Shanks, as Auditor of the State of Kentucky.

This case was argued by Mr. Matthew O'Dogherty for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Swager Shirley for the defendant in error.

C. C. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of the United States, etc., Petitioner;
71 vs.
Electric Reduction Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. Leo Huslander for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Blackburn Esterline in this behalf, It is ordered that Hiram C. Todd, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; Fletcher Rockwood, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, and Charles E. Nichols, Jr., Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carlyle S. Littleton, It is ordered that Scott T. Fitzhugh, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Brown, It is ordered that John Arthur Brown, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will adjourn at 2 P.M. to-morrow.

The United States of America,

394 vs.

Glen Murray.

O R D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court, in accordance with section 239 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the Act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat.936), that the entire record in this cause be certified to this Court so that the whole matter in controversy may be considered by this Court; and the cause is hereby assigned for argument on Monday, November 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day, to be heard with case No. 539, Frederick A. Cook, petitioner, vs. The United States of America, should the Court grant the petition for a writ of certiorari now pending in the latter case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. Dittburner,

Plaintiff in error,

383 vs.

The State of Tennessee.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and the plaintiff in error having been three times solemnly called by the Marshal to come into Court and prosecute his writ of error, and failing to appear,

It is, thereupon, in pursuance of the 19th rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pordson Coal Company,

Plaintiff in error,

72 vs.

John M. Moore, successor to John M. Jonson, Sheriff of Pike County.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Wallace R. Middleton for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President, Petitioner,
73 vs.
Arkansas Land & Lumber Company.

This case was argued by Mr. J. Q. Mahaffey for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. P. McFaddin for the respondent.

Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error,
75 vs.
The State of Wisconsin.
Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error,
76 vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

These cases were argued by Mr. Sam T. Swansen and Mr. George Lines for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Franklin E. Bump for the defendants in error.

Gunder Draxton, Edward Brandson, Ole Norgaard, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
77 vs.
C. P. Fitch, O. W. Healy, M. Carroll, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Victor E. Anderson for the defendants in error, and submitted by Mr. James Manahan for the plaintiffs in error.

A. B. Leach & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
78 vs.
Walter Peirson.

This case was argued by Mr. Francis Rawle for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Arthur Brown for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Reuben S. Lind, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. Mell Brooks and Blytheville Special School District No. 5, Plaintiffs in error,
88 vs.
Ralph Koonce, as State Treasurer of the State of Arkansas.

The mandate in this case was granted, per stipulation of counsel.

City of Philadelphia, ex relatione Daniel J. Furey, taxpayer, et al., Appellants,
92 vs.
Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company, William D. B. Ainey, James S. Benn, et al., etc.

This case was continued, per stipulation of counsel.

E. G. Griffin, C. S. Littleton and Southern Surety Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

80 vs.

George L. Powers, J. A. Gholson, F. W. Meacham, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Carlyle S. Littleton for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Henry W. McMaster and Francis H. Skelding, as Receiver of the Wabash Pittsburgh Terminal Railway Company,

Petitioners,

85 vs.

George J. Gould, Kingdon Gould, et al., as Executors, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wemell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley., Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace Streater, It is ordered that John W. Burrus, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Friedman, It is ordered that Joseph Loeffler and David Friedman, Esquires, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank It is ordered that Lusk M. Colville, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor o. this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Eldridge Hart, Esquire, of Winter Park, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, It is ordered that D. H. Hill Arnold, Esquire, of Elkins, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abram F. Myers, It is ordered that E. A. McCulloch, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Ida May Southwell, Administratrix of H. J. Southwell. 41

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the said cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Dora Goodman, Administratrix of Nathan Goodman, deceased. 58

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this

cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

John Lapique, Successor in interest of the Estate of Maria Espiritu Chiljulla De Leonis, etc., Appellant,
158 vs.
Frank E. Walsh, Frank E. Walsh, Administrator, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rupert Hibnik, Plaintiff in error,
569 vs.
Andrew F. McBride, Commissioner of Labor of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 407. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. Alice M. Ramsey et al.

No. 408. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, vs. Alice M. Ramsey, et al.

No. 409. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. W. O. James, et al.

No. 410. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, vs. W. O. James et al.

No. 411. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. Ramsey Petroleum Company, et al.

No. 412. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, vs. Ramsey Petroleum Company, et al.

No. 413. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. C. L. Ramsey, et al.

No. 414. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, vs. G. L. Ramsey, et al.

No. 415. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. M. R. Chastain, et al.

No. 416. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, vs. M. R. Chastain, et al.

No. 417. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, vs. A. L. Lloyd, et al.

C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., Plaintiff in error,
418 vs.
A. L. Lloyd, et al.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error in these cases to consolidate them all for hearing, with directions to print the whole record in two of the cases and only so much of the record in the remaining cases as is necessary to show the difference between the cases,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, the ultimate cost of printing, of course, to await the event, and the effect of any omission to print, to be at the risk of the plaintiffs in error moving for the consolidation and the limitation of printing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner,
36 vs.
The State of Texas.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

It is now here ordered that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated, for the reason that the grounds advanced for the granting of the writ prove, upon an examination of the record, not to have a substantial basis.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The State of Texas.

36

On motion to strike from the files as improper, seven pages of a reply brief filed by one of counsel for the petitioner in this cause.

The matter excepted to is an effort by counsel for the petitioner to minimize and detract from the weight of a supplemental record which the Court permitted to be filed, by a recital of correspondence and communications between opposing counsel with an intimation that, contrary to an agreement, no opportunity had been furnished to oppose the filing.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

The Supplemental Record was filed by order of the Court. No motion was made to have the order revoked or the record stricken from the files. We cannot approve of this insinuating and irregular method of reflecting on opposing counsel, and on the relevancy and weight of a document which the Court has permitted to be filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pordson Coal Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. John M. Moore, successor to John M. Johnson, Sheriff of Pike County.

72

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fordson Coal Company,

Plaintiff in error,

72 vs.

John M. Moore, as successor of John M. Johnson, Sheriff of Pike County.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gunder Draxton, Edward Brandson, Ole Norgaard, et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

77 vs.

C. P. Fitch, O. W. Healy, N. Carroll, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. G. Griffin, C. S. Littleton, and Southern Surety Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

80 vs.

George L. Powers, J. A. Gholson, F. W. Meacham, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jerry R. McCoy,
Petitioner,
403 vs.
A. S. J. Shaw, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma and The Pure Oil Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Stateof Oklahoma is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward E. Jenkins, as Receiver of the National City Bank of Salt Lake City,
Petitioners,
424 vs.
National Surety Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Midland National Bank of Minneapolis,
Petitioner,
425 vs.
Dakota Life Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Gainesville,
Petitioner,
433 vs.
Brown-Crummer Investment Company, Southern Surety Company and H. O. Head, Executor of H. W. Head.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charley Hee, alias Dong Bow Hee, Petitioner,
446 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick A. Cook,
Petitioner,
539 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ruby Steamship Corporation, Ltd., Petitioner,
386 vs.
Johnson & Higgins.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William R. George, Petitioner,
389 vs.
The State of Idaho.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charlotte F. Jones, Petitioner,
390 vs.
The Counties Gas and Electric Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Lehigh and Hudson River Railway Company, Petitioner,
393 vs.
John H. Hubbard.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles W. Bostrom, Lawrence W. Lawson, Clyde H. Young, Jr., et al., etc., Petitioners,
395 vs.
Cuyamel Fruit Company, claimant and owner of Steamship "Nicarao" and W. G. Coyle and Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Willett, et al., Petitioners,
396 vs.
Robert F. Herrick, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Norfolk, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Norfolk, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Bank and Trust Company
of Helena, Montana,
Petitioner,
397 vs.
Lester H. Loble, as Trustee in
Bankruptcy of Gans & Klein Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorar herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

PerMr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Woitte, Frank M. Bates,
Joseph Essex, et al.,
Petitioners,
398 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Josephine H. Plane,
Petitioner,
402 vs.
Walter E. Carr, as District
Director of Immigration of the
United States for the District of
Los Angeles.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Fred Ludwig, Alfred A. Gotshall, and
Leland L. Morris, Partners, etc.,
Petitioners,
405 vs.
W. S. Raydure, a partnership, Selina
Raydure, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Lucas County, State of Ohio and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pittsburgh Hotels Company,
Petitioner,
406 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank P. Blair,
Petitioner,
419 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Globe Indemnity Company of New York, Petitioner,
420 vs.
County of Scotts Bluff, Nebraska Peter B. Schmidt as County Treasurer of Scotts Bluff, Nebraska, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Schrijver, Adolph Krijn, and Lehman Rudolph Krijn, co-partners, etc., Petitioners,
421 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Modern Workmen of the World, The
Modern Workmen of the World Society, Samuel J. Master, et al., Petitioners,
422 vs.
Charles A. Hartmann, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stock Yards Loan Company, Petitioner,
423 vs.
Commercial National Bank of Independence, Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel M. Hastings, as Administrator of the Estate of Thomas Rankin, Deceased, Petitioner,
426 vs.
Nina K. Jones, Executrix of Frank Graham Jones, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Morton E. Converse & Son Company, Petitioner,
428 vs.
H. C. White Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Company, Petitioner,
429 vs.
State of Arkansas ex rel. Attorney General.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oil Fields Corporation, Petitioner,
432 vs.
John S. Dashko, T. P. Novick, Olga Novick, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. W. Bassett, A. Pincolini and
G. D. Madalena,
Petitioners,
434 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. C. Clapp,
Petitioner,
435 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Massachusetts Bonding and Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
436 vs.
National Surety Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barney Pearlman,
Petitioner,
438 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Hanna Stoker Company,
Petitioner,
439 vs.
Locomotive Stoker Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Philippine National Bank,
Petitioner,
440 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Green-Moore & Co., Inc., J. E. Lowe and Crawford Doyle, Petitioners,
441 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The O. K. Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
442 vs.
The Bassick Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Larkin Automotive Parts Company, Petitioner,
443 vs.
The Bassick Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maurice Kay and Benjamin Kay,
Petitioners,
444 vs.
Edgar C. Snyder, United States Marshal, etc., and Needham C. Turnage, United States Commissioner, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Norwegian American Securities Corporation, Petitioner,
445 vs.
Henry H. Kaufman, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
107 vs.
United Cigar Stores Company of America.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell on behalf of the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Levi Lurie,
Petitioner,
555 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Walters, Mr. Arthur P. Hicks, and Mr. Cashan P. Head for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Mark Skinner Willing and The Northern Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
561 vs.
Chicago Auditorium Association.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. Homer H. Cooper, and Mr. Samuel Topliff for the petitioners, and by Mr. Walter L. Fisher and Mr. William C. Boyden for the respondent.

Milton E. Springer, Dalmacio Costas, et al.,
Petitioners,
564 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jose Abad Santos, Mr. James Ross, Mr. Quintin Paredes, and Mr. Claro M. Recto for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. Hugh C. Smith for the respondent.

Automotive Products Corporation,
Petitioner,
568 vs.
Wolverine Bumper & Specialty Company., Rollie B. Fageol and American Chain Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick S. Duncan for the respondents.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc.,
Petitioner,
571 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Gibbons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Gregorio Agoncillo, Baldomero Roas, and Catalino Lavadia,
Petitioners,
573 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jose Abad Santos, Mr. James Ross, Mr. Quintin Paredes, and Mr. Claro M. Recto for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. Hugh C. Smith for the resonient.

Standard Pipe Line Company,
Incorporated,
Petitioner,
577 vs.
Miller County Highway & Bridge District.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Arnold and Mr. David C. Arnold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the respondent.

Daisy L. Burneson,
Petitioner,
583 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Gentsch and Mr. Joseph W. Heintzman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 21, at

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dozier A. DeVane, It is ordered that Thomas M. Shackleford, Jr., Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger, It is ordered that George W. White, Esquire, of Michigan City, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that Vincent I. Campagno and Walter C. Fox, Jr., Esquires, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, It is ordered that Anthony N. Skapiak, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Steinem, It is ordered that Albert W. Chapman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Daniel P. McDonald and Clarence T. Ellis, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew T. Smith, It is ordered that Virgil Y. Moore, Esquire, of Madisonville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russel Alden, It is ordered that Franklin F. Phillips, Jr., Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that John Dillon Fitzgerald, Madison L. Hill, and David Fillmore Smith, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that William Seth Atkins, Esquire, of Hope, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

210 vs.

Oesterlein Machine Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and as so modified, is affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

W. C. Tucker,

Petitioner,

167 vs.

Acel C. Alexander, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, ————— for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,

Petitioner,

219 vs.

The Colonial Trust Company Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

C. G. Lewellyn, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-Third District of Pennsylvania,

Petitioner,

220 vs.

The Colonial Trust Comany, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. R. E. Ellzey. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

63

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

C. C. Lewellyn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of the United States, etc., Petitioner, vs. Electric Reduction Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the third Circuit.

71

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs and the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Equitable Trust Company of New
York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy
of Knauth, Nachod & Kuhne,
Petitioner,
34 vs.
Carl Rochling et al., trading as
Gebrueder Rochling.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Alexander Latzko, William Latzko,
Charles Latzko, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
48 vs.
Equitable Trust Company of New York,
Trustee in Bankruptcy.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Equitable Trust Company of New York
Trustee in Bankruptcy,
Petitioner,
49 vs.
Alexander Latzko, William Latzko,
Charles Latzko, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, and the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part and reversed in part, with costs against the respondents herein; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General
of Railroads, as Agent Designated
by the President, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
74 vs.
Thomas E. O'Neil.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent Designated by the President, etc.,

Plaintiff in error,

74 vs.

Thomas E. O'Neil.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

L. M. Willcuts, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota,

Petitioner,

156 vs.

Milton Dairy Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs and the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

News Syndicate Company,

235 vs.

The New York Central Railroad Company, The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, et al.

On certificate from the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Question 1 be answered "Yes, for the ascertainment of damages," Question 2 be answered "Yes", Question 3 be answered "Yes", and Question 4 is not answered.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

William C. Atwater & Company, Incorporated,

Appellant,

17 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, ans was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Joseph E. Marron,
Petitioner,
185 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Ben W. Steele, Executor of Estate of A. B. Steele, deceased,
Petitioner,
60 vs.
J. H. Drummond.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The State of Washington on the Relation of Stimson Timber Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. E. V. Kuykendall (John C. Denny, substituted) as Director of Public Works of the State of Washington, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

66

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company et al., Petitioners, vs. E. B. Spiller, et al.

On motion to amend judgment and retax costs.

October Term, 1926.

577

On consideration of the motion to amend the judgment and retax the costs in this case, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy
Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
57 vs.
Wells-Dickey Trust Company,
Special Administrator of the
Estate of Elmer E. Anderson,
deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

City of Hammond,
Petitioner,
67 vs.
Schappi Bus Line, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, without costs to either party in this Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

City of Hammond,

Petitioner,

68 vs.

Farina Bus Line and Transportation Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, withoutcosts to either party in this court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

F. H. Mason,

Petitioner,

152 vs.

C. F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Millsaps College, Plaintiff in error, vs. City of Jackson. 14

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Gulf, Colorado & Sante Fe Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Olena Moser, Administratrix. 53

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and it is further ordered that the said cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Wisconsin. 75 — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Wisconsin. 76 — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

John W. Blodgett,

154 vs.

Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is the opinion of this Court, that Question 2 should be answered, "The Revenue Act of 1924 did not impose a tax on gifts made during January, 1924." It is only necessary to answer the one question.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Sanford and Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America, Petitioner,

175 vs.

Ole Berkeness.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Alaska.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Ray C. Simmons,

Petitioner,

65 vs.

Edward P. Swan.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Mercantile Trust Company of St. Louis, Missouri,

Petitioner,

69 vs.

Wilmot Road District.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
78 vs.
Walter Peirson.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Fairmont Creamery Company,
Plaintiff in error,
725, October Term, 1926 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On motion to amend judgment and reform mandate.

On consideration of the motion to amend the judgment and reform the mandate in this case, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this motion.

Gong Lum and Chew How, next friends for Martha Lum, Plaintiffs in error, vs. C. P. Rice, L. C. Brown, Henry McGowan, et al. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

29

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner, vs. Collector of Internal Revenue. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

42

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Jessie L. Wickwire, Individually and as Executrix and Trustee under the Last Will and Testament of Edward L. Wickwire, deceased. Petitioner,
149 vs.
Mabel G. Reinecke, as Collector and as Acting Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois in this cause be, and the same are hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Augustin Segurola and Manuel Santiago, Petitioners,
195 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Porto Rico.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Henry Hunter,
Plaintiff in error,
599 vs.
State of Louisiana.

Frank Nigro,
600 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered that these criminal cases upon the docket be, and they are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, December 5, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: In the Matter of
Charles A. Stutzman.
——, Original.

On motion for leave to file a petition for habeas corpus in this case and to proceed in forma pauperis therein.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file a petition for habeas corpus in this case and to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered that these motions be, and the same are hereby, denied for the reason that the Court, upon examination of the unprinted petition, and papers accompanying it, finds that there are no grounds upon which the writ of habeas corpus can be issued.

The costs already incurred herein by direction of the Court shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Goon Bon June,
Petitioner,
448 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Columbia, South Carolina, Petitioner,

456 vs.

Chas. S. Mitchell, W. E. Richardson, Truckers Supply Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Republic of France, Compagnie Franco-Indo Chinoise and Engineering Timer Company, Ltd., Petitioner,

459 vs.

French Overseas Corporation, as owner of the schooner "Malcolm Baxter, Jr."

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, a corporation, Petitioner,

472 vs.

Hildur Haglund, as Administratrix of the Estate of Ernest Haglund, deceased, et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition Herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
473 vs.
Moore Shipbuilding Company, a corporation, and Rolph Navigation & Coal Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Carter Oil Company, J. Wood Glass, F. A. Calvert, et al., Petitioners,
496 vs.
Taylor Eli, James Eli, Charlotte Chuculate, etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas J. Casey, Petitioner,
500 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Fireman's Fund Insurance Company.

510

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company.

511

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A. Petitioner, vs. Northwestern Fire & Marine Insurance Company.

512

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Hartford Fire Insurance Company. 513

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. National Liberty Insurance Company. 514

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Aetna Insurance Company. 515

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Western Assurance Company. 516

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Company, Ltd. 517

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Springfield Fire & Marine Insurance Company. 518

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Franklin Fire Insurance Company.

519

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Phoenix Insurance Company.

520

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kark Buzynski, Petitioner, vs. Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., and The Texas Contracting Company, Inc.

534

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. B. Caplinger, as County Judge of Poinsett County, Arkansas, Petitioner,
538 vs.
United States on relation of Harriman National Bank.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company, Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mark Skinner Willing and The Northern Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners,
561 vs.
Chicago Auditorium Association.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion,
Interior, S. A.,
Petitioner,
519 vs.
Franklin Fire Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion,
Interior, S. A.,
Petitioner,
520 vs.
Phoenix Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kark Buzynski,
Petitioner,
534 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.,
and The Texas Contracting
Company, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. B. Caplinger, as County Judge of Poinsett County, Arkansas, Petitioner,
538 vs.
United States on relation of Harriman National Bank.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company, Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mark Skinner Willing and The Northern Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners,
561 vs.
Chicago Auditorium Association.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Milton E. Springer, Dalmacio Costas and Anselmo Hilario, Petitioners,
564 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gregorio Agoncillo, Baldomero Roxas and Catalino Lavadia, Petitioners,
573 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Pipe Line Company, Incorporated, Petitioner.,
577 vs.
Miller County Highway & Bridge District.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth C. Taft,
Petitioner,
554 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration or decision of the petition for writ of certiorari in this case.

Gilbert C. Greenway, Jr.,
Petitioner,
575 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of the petition for writ of certiorari in this case.

Robert H. Aldredge,
Petitioner,
447 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tribond Sales Corporation,
Petitioner,
450 vs.
Harry S. New, Postmaster General of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sarah Marcus Greenberg,
Petitioner,
451 vs.
The Pennsylvania Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
452 vs.
James M. Russell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Exchange Irving Trust Company, Petitioner, vs. Leon Bonnasse, Joseph Bonnasse, and Eugene Bonnasse, doing business under the firm name and style of Banque Bonnasse and Banque Privee, et al.

457 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick A. McDonnell, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

458 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmer C. Dyer, et al., Petitioners, vs. George A. Stauffer, as Marshal, etc., et al.

460 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chimney Rock Company, a
Corporation, Petitioner,
461 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New Britain Machine Company,
a corporation under the laws of
the State of Ohio,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
Emma Cone.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York,
Petitioner,
466 vs.
The New York Central Railroad
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Riverside Oil & Refining Company, Petitioner, vs. Cimarron River Oil Company, Sophie Mussellem, M. S. Mussellem, et al.

469 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Martin Woodward.

470 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peoples Transit Company, Petitioner, vs. George A. Henshaw, et al., receivers of the Oklahoma Railway Company.

474 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pere Marquette Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
475 vs.
Frank Farrelli.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alfred Leeb and Louis Nova,
co-partners doing business under the firm name and style of Batjer & Company, Petitioners,
476 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Old Honesty Oil Company,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
Clara B. Shuler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Van Dusen Harrington Company,
Petitioner,
478 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James R. Caton, Joseph C. Koogle, Fannie P. Gilbert, et al.,
Petitioners,
479 vs.
Michigan Sanitarium and Benevolent Association et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Coloumbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Parente and Armando Bonacorsi,
Petitioners,
480 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph J. Weinhandler,
Petitioner,
481 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Glendola Steamship Corporation,
Petitioner,
482 vs.
Standard Oil Company, (N.J.)

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Union Trust Company of New York, Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Frederic A. Juilliard, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
483 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornell Steamboat Company,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
State Industrial Board and Ida C. Benson, widow, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York..

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boston Insurance Company of Boston, Massachusetts,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
John S. Sorenson and T. B. S. Nielsen, co-partners trading under the name, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
486 vs.
W. N. Hayes, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
487 vs.
Cimarron River Oil Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisa C. Aichner,
Petitioner,
488 vs.
Commonwealth Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reeves Coal and Dock Company,
E. T. McDonald, Receiver etc.,
Petitioner,
489 vs.
George E. Geddes.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Camp Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
491 vs.
S. Liles Miller, Administrator of the Estate of D. B. Miller, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Freight Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
492 vs.
Batchelder & Snyder Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roy Olmstead, Jerry L. Finch, Clarence G. Healy, et al.,
Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles S. Green, Emory A. Kern, Z. J. Hendrick, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

532

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward H. McInnis, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

533

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. E. Easton, Petitioner, vs. Susan T. Brant, C. M. Sperry, Southwestern Securities Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

494

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clinchfield Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
495 vs.
Elice H. Dunn, Administratrix of the Estate of Milledge D. Hunnicutt, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kerr Steamship Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
498 vs.
Radio Corporation of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Pleich, Sr.,
Petitioner,
499 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It isnow here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lewis G. Norton,
Petitioner,
502 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wolf Mineral Process Corporation,
Petitioner,
503 vs.
Minerals Separation North American Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wehr Company,
Petitioner,
504 vs.
Roy J. Wilson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Czarnikow-Rionda Company,
Petitioner,
506 vs.
West Market Grocery Company (formerly known as Sheppard Strassheim Co.)

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Rich,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner,
508 vs.
Terry Packing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Wohlstatter, next friend of Jew Lee,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
A. W. Brough, Chinese Inspector in Charge at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Star Ball Player Company,
Petitioner,
523 vs.
The Playograph Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucinda Haldeman, as Administratrix of the goods, chattels, rights, and credits, which were of Fred Haldeman, deceased,
Petitioner,
525 vs.
Reading Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest Wiltse, on behalf of
himself, Arthur J. Stevens and
H. Snowden Marshall, as Receivers,
etc., et al., Petitioners,
524 vs.
Francis R. Hart, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael F. Loughman, President
of the State Tax Commission,
and John J. Merrill et al.,
State Tax Commissioners, etc.,
Petitioners,
526 vs.
Martha J. Smith, as sole executrix
of the last will and testament
of Mary J. Smith, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lena Kahlstrom, as Administratrix of the Estate of Charles Kahlstrom, deceased. Petitioner,

527 vs.

International Stevedoring Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fordson Coal Company, Petitioner,

528 vs.

Wiley Spurlock, T. H. Webb, Taylor Spurlock, et al.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, Petitioner,

529 vs.

The World Publishing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General
of Railroads, as Agent,
Petitioner,
530 vs.
Tulsa Paper Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General
of Railroads, as Agent,
Petitioner,
531 vs.
Democrat Printing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jerome C. Farquhar,
Petitioner,
535 vs.
William M. Henderson and Plymouth Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Francis J. McDonald,
Petitioner,
536 vs.
Albert T. Rosasco.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Munson Steamship Line,
Petitioner,
537 vs.
Dampskibs Aktieselskabet Jeanette Skinner, owner of the Norwegian Steamship "John Bakke".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McCormick Intercoastal Steamship Company, claimant, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
540 vs.
Yamashita Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, claimant, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bachus-Brooks Company,
Petitioner,
541 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John D. Key, in his own behalf and as the guardian ad litem of Margaret Key, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
542 vs.
Panama Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morgan & Bird Gravel Company, Inc., represented by J. P. Wilkinson, receiver,
Petitioner,
544 vs.
M. T. Walker, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Petitioner,
545 vs.
C. F. Grohe-Henrich & Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Ben Franklin Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
546 vs.
William M. Filkins, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of U.S. Pulp Products Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Yorkshire Insurance Company, Limited, Petitioner,
547 vs.
William M. Filkins, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of U. S. Pulp Products Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tucker Barnett and Wysey Winn,

Petitioners,

550 vs.

Prairie Oil & Gas Company, W. A. Kunkle, Hannah Bird, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Old Colony Trust Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

553 vs.

John F. Malley, Former Collector of Internal Revenue, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Levi Lurie,

Petitioner,

555 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Garfield A. Street,

Petitioner,

556 vs.

Emily M. Stubblefield and Emily M. Stubblefield, Executrix of Thomas W. Stubblefield.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur L. Bisbee, Frank J. Bisbee, Edgar C. Bisbee,

Petitioners,

557 vs.

Midland Linseed Products Company, E. C. Warner Company, Grain Securities Company, Ltd., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Auto Motive Equipment Company and Gilfillan Bros., Inc.,

Petitioners,

560 vs.

The Connecticut Telephone & Electric Company, Incorporated.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Leon Kanner, Joseph Kanner and Max Kanner, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

562

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Theodore Davis Boal, as Executor of the will of Annie B. Davis, deceased, and Kate Atwood, Individually, etc., Petitioners, vs. Metropolitan Museum of Art of the City of New York and the Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, as Administrator, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

567

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nathan Bard, Petitioner, vs. John B. Chilton, Warden, Kentucky State Penitentiary, Herbert Woodruff Sheriff of Hopkins County, etc., et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

565

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the

Bunyan Fleming,

Petitioner,

566 vs.

John B. Chilton, Warden, Kentucky State Penitentiary, Herbert Woodruff, Sheriff of Hopkins County, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Automotive Products Corporation,

Petitioner,

568 vs.

Wolverine Bumper & Specialty Company, Rollie B. Fageol and American Chain Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Marcus and Benjamin Marcus,

Petitioners,

570 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

571

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daisy L. Burneson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

583

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Otis Elevator Company, Petitioner, vs. Lois Hoskins and Hotel Randolph Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

563

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration or decision of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case.

Mollie Tiger and Baby Cumsey,
by C. L. Garber, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
490 vs.
F. S. Lozier, C. F. Robertson,
J. Garfield Buell, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Warren E. Brown, First National
Bank of Dover, First National Bank
of Upper Sandusky, et al.,
Petitioners,
497 vs.
Louis H. Krietmeyer.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also
known as the Royal Administration
of the Swedish State Railways,
Petitioner,
558 vs.
The National City Bank of New York
and Dexter and Carpenter, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as the Royal Administration of the Swedish State Railways,

Petitioner,

559 vs.

Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gypsy Oil Company,

Petitioner,

572 vs.

Leo Bennett Escoe, a Minor, by O. W. Stephens, Guardian, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re Abraham S. Gilbert.

No.__,Orig.

Pursuant to an order of this Court entered on November 21, 1927, you are hereby ordered to show cause before this Court, on or before Monday, December 12, 1927, and to make written report to this Court showing what fees or allowances have been paid to you(also when and by whom paid) for services as Master in the several causes reviewed by this Court during the October Term, 1921, and reported in 259 U.S. Reports at page 101, et seq., under the following titles:

No. 750. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., vs. Consolidated Gas Company of New York.

No. 751. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., vs. New York & Queens Gas Company.

No. 752. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., vs. Central Union Gas Company.

No. 753. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., vs. Northern Union Gas Company.

No. 832. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., vs. New York Mutual Gas Light Company.

No. 833. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., vs. Standard Gas Light Company of the City of New York.

No. 844. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., vs. New Amsterdam Gas Company.

No. 845. Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., vs. The East River Gas Company of Long Island City.

It is further ordered that you likewise report whether you have returned or repaid any portion of the fees or allowances received by you as such Master, with dates and names of the parties.

And it is further ordered that, if you have received fees or allowances as such Master in any of the specified causes exceeding the maximum amount held by this Court to be permissible, and have not returned or repaid the excess, then that you shall show cause why your name should not be stricken from the roll of attorneys permitted to practice before this Court, and be punished for contempt, or otherwise dealt with, as the circumstances may require.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
13, Orig. vs.
The State of Idaho.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in behalf of counsel for the defendant, leave was granted to file answer of the defendant in this cause.

The United States,
Petitioner,
283 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Isadore N. Hellman.
Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
Milton C. Hellman.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

A. R. Young Construction Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
391 vs.
D. E. Dunne, etc.

The motion for leave to file a designation of additional parts of the record to be printed in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Willard Brooks and Mr. Charles M. Miller for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

Louisville Gas & Electric Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
70 vs.
W. H. Shanks, as Auditor of the State of Kentucky.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. C. R. McAtee, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief for the plaintiff in error in this cause.

James C. Colgate,
Appellant,
592 vs.
The Philadelphia Electric Power Company, et al., etc.

The motion to advance this case and for a restraining order was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Carusi in behalf of counsel for the appellant and by Mr. Wm. Clarke Mason, in opposition thereto.

John J. Mitchell, Augustine L. Humes, Illinois Merchants Trust Company, as Executors,
Petitioners,
376 vs.
The United States.

The death of John J. Mitchell, one of the executors and a party petitioner in this cause, having been suggested, It is now here ordered that the case be continued in the name of the surviving executors, on motion of Mr. Milward W. Martin and Mr. A. L. Humes in that behalf.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. E. Thomas, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Wilson Mercantile Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
576 vs.
J. M. Lester.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Rozier Dulany, Jr., Mr. A. L. Adams, and Mr. H. L. Ponder for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Merrick Moore and Mr. Clifton W. Gray for the respondent.

Leo J. Gonch,
Petitioner,
580 vs.
Republic Storage Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Loughran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Outerbridge Horsey for the respondent.

American Colonial Bank of Porto Rico, Petitioner,
581 vs.
Mercedes y Cobian et al.
American Colonial Bank of Porto Rico, Petitioner,
582 vs.
Mercedes Guerra y Cobian et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis E. Neagle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugh R. Francis for the respondents.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner.
584 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company, Edwin L. Belshe, Robert B. Stout, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se, and by Mr. John T. Evans for the respondents.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals fot the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se, and by Mr. John T. Evans for the respondent..

John A. Vesey,
Petitioner,
587 vs.
V. K. Irion, Commissioner of Conservation of the State of Louisiana, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. C. Milling and Mr. Eugene D. Saunders for the petitioner.

Edwin C. Jameson, Leroy W. Baldwin, Louis V. Bright, et al., etc., Petitioners,
588 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York and Merrel P. Callaway, as Trustees, Robert T. Swaine, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Lewis Smith, Mr. Robert Kelly Prentice, and Mr. Irvine L. Lenroot for the petitioners, and by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. Ralph M. Shaw, Mr. H. H. Field, Mr. Paul D. Cravath, Mr. Robert T. Swaine, Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Edwin S. S. Sunderland, and Mr. William A. W. Stewart for the respondents.

Columbus Electric & Power Company and S. Morgan Smith Company, Petitioners,
590 vs.
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company and William M. White.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert C. Alston and Mr. Hubert Howson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clifton V. Edwards, Mr. George F. DeWein, and Mr. J. Blanc Monroe for the respondents.

Percival Wilds, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Winfield Scott Morris, trading as Scott Morris & Company, Petitioner,
591 vs.
Lebanon National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Caruthers Ewing and Mr. Bertram F. Shipman for the petitioner, and by Mr. John E. Joyce for the respondent.

California Highway Indemnity Exchange, Petitioner,
593 vs.
Marie Kruger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellwood P. Morey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin J. Baumberger for the respondent.

The Village of University Heights and John Migchelbrink, Inspector of Buildings, etc.,
Petitioners,
594 vs.
The Cleveland Jewish Orphan Home.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the petitioners, and by Mr. Newton D. Baker and Mr. Robert M. Morgan for the respondent.

W. Freeland Dalzell,
Petitioner,
595 vs.
Steamship "Hermes", Bruusgaard Kiosteruds Dampskibs Aktieselskabet.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey L. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Griffin for the respondent..

Morimura, Arai & Co.,
Petitioners,
597 vs.
Nathan Taback and Louis Taback, individually and as copartners trading as Taback Brothers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr. for the petitioners, and by Mr. David H. Bilder and Mr. Nathan Bilder for the respondents.

Hussey Tie Company,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
Knickerbocker Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel W. Fordyce, Mr. John H. Holliday, Mr. Thomas W. White, and Mr. Walter R. Mayne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wendell P. Barker, Mr. Thos. S. McPheeters, and Mr. Henry Davis for the respondent.

John Howell,

Plaintiff in error,

437 vs.

The State of Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commercial Credit Company,

Petitioner,

258 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1927 -

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonard A. Flansburg, It is ordered that William H. Herdman, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. England, It is ordered that William S. O'Brien, John C. McWhorter, and Ulysses G. Young, Esquires, of Buckhannon, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Donovan, It is ordered that William J. O'Donovan, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Eugene Kelly, It is ordered that Carl H. Zeiss, Esquire, of Winnetka, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Charles H. Loud and Rudolph Nelstead, Esquires, of Miles City, State of Montana, and Albert H. Angstman, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barry Mohun, It is ordered that Russell I. Hare, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Jay D. Coulter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Monte Appel, It is ordered that Edwin S. Pillsbury, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Graupner, It is ordered that J. M. Mannon, Jr., Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Stockslager, It is ordered that Arthur C. Gunther, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Commercial Credit Company, Petitioner, 258 vs. The United States of America.	The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent. Leave was granted petitioner to file a reply brief on or before Friday next.
The United States of America, and The Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, 293 vs. The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, The Arkansas Western Railway Company, Fort Smith and Van Buren Railway Company, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the appellant, the United States of America, and by Mr. S. W. Moore for the appellees.
Arthur Rich, Plaintiff in error, 543 vs. The People of the State of Michigan.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harry Eugene Kelly for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Thornton M. Pratt for the plaintiff inerror. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Finkelstein & Kommel, Petitioners, 346 vs. The United States.	This case was argued by Mr. Frederick W. Brooks, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.
John P. Donnelley 110 vs. The United States of America.	This case was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States, and the case was submitted by Mr. Henry M. Hoyt and Mr. Frank H. Norcross for Donnelley.

The United States of America

394 vs.

Glen Murray.

Frederick A. Cook,

Petitioner,

539 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of case No. 539 was commenced by Mr. H. C. Wade for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Bride, It is ordered that Thomas H. Healy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Melville Monheimer, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Wright, It is ordered that Addison G. Kistle, Esquire, of Council Bluffs, State of Iowa, be admitted to pratice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Mannon, Jr., It is ordered that F. Eldred Boland, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Wright, It is ordered that Charles E. Swanson, Esquire, of Council Bluffs, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Wright, It is ordered that Frank E. Northrop, Esquire, of Council Bluffs, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that William J. Oven, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
7, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The report of the Special Master in this case was presented to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, the Special Master herein, and the report ordered filed.

Ella R. Clarke,
Plaintiff in error,
96 vs.
Shoshoni Lumber Company and Allan Boysen.

This case was passed for ninety days on motion of Mr. Wm. J. Hughes Jr., for the plaintiff in error.

The United States of America

394 vs.

Glen Murray.

Frederick A. Cook,

Petitioner,

539 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. H. C. Wade for the petitioner in No. 539, and concluded by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States.

United Fuel Gas Company,

Appellant,

79 vs.

The Public Service Commission of West Virginia, I. Wade Coffman, and C. E. Nethken, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Robert S. Spilman for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court in adjourned until Monday, next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mary O'Toole, It is ordered that Thomas F. Cameron, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer, It is ordered that Truman D. Wade, Esquire, of Phoenixville, State of Pennsylvania, and W. L. Cook, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as ~~xx~~ Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Paul Yaselli, It is ordered that S. Lawrence Miller, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Joseph Bearak, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
176 vs.
Standard Oil Company of Kentucky.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Standard Oil Company, Incorporated in Kentucky, Petitioner,
177 vs.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the UnitedStates Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof,It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice Announced the following orders of the Court.

The United States,
Petitioner,
283 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company., E. R. Brown, R. Waverly Smith, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Isadore M. Hellman.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
Milton C. Hellman.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Colgate,
Appellant,
592 vs.
Philadelphia Electric Power Company, Nathan R. Buller, William D. B. Ainey, et al., etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, January 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

The motion for a restraining order in this case is denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. R. Young Construction Company and Cecil L. Newbold, Receiver, Plaintiffs in error,
391 vs.
D. E. Dunne, G. C. Dunne and C. M. Dunne, partners, etc.

On consideration of the motion of the defendants in error for leave to file a designation of parts of the record to be printed in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, the printing of the same to be at the expense of the moving party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants,
293 vs.
The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, The Arkansas Western Railway Company, Fort Smith and Van Buren Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri with directions to vacate the injunction decree and dismiss the petition for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Rich,
Plaintiff in error,
543 vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Finkelstein & Kommel,
Petitioners,
346 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Court of Customs Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Williamsport Wire Rope Company, Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. E. Thomas, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Wilson Mercantile Company Bankrupt, Petitioner,
576 vs.
J. M. Lester.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leo J. Gonch, Petitioner,
580 vs.
Republic Storage Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Colonia Bank of Porto Rico, Petitioner,
581 vs.
Mercedes Guerra y Cobian, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Colonial Bank of Porto Rico, Petitioner,
582 vs.
Mercedes Buerra y Cobian, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. F. Vance, Petitioner,
584 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company, Edwin L. Belshe, Robert B. Stout, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of the United States for the Northn District of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. F. Vance, Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon, had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. Vesey,

Petitioner,

587 vs.

V. K. Irion, Commissioner, of Conservation of the State of Louisiana, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Columbus Electric & Power Company and S. Morgan Smith Company,

Petitioners,

590 vs.

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company and William M. White.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Percival Wilds, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Winfield Scott Norris, trading as Scott Norris & Company, Petitioner,

591 vs.

Lebanon National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

California Highway Indemnity Exchange, Petitioner,
593 vs.
Marie Kruger.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Village of University Heights and John Migchelbrink, Inspector of Buildings, etc.,
Petitioners,
594 vs.
The Cleveland Jewish Orphan Home.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. Freeland Dalzell,
Petitioner,
595 vs.
Steamship Hermes, Bruusgaard Kiosteruds Dampskibs Aktieselskabet.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hussey Tie Company,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
Knickerbocker Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edwin C. Jameson, Leroy W. Baldwin, Louis V. Bright, et al., etc., Petitioners,
588 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York and Merrel P. Callaway, as Trustee, Robert T. Swaine, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of the petition for certiorari in this case.

In Re:
Abraham S. Gilbert.
No.—, Original.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the time within which to file a return to the rule to show cause, issued pursuant to the order of this Court herein, dated November 21, 1927, be, and the same is hereby, extended to January 16, 1928.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Wisconsin, et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.
State of Michigan,
Complainant
11, Original.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The report of the Special Master showing his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for a decree having been presented to the Court in printed form on the 23rd day of this month, It is now here ordered that the parties to these causes be allowed severally until and including the 3rd day of January, 1928, to print and present exceptions, if any they may have, to such report or any part of the same.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Company,
Petitioner,
629 vs.
L. P. Larson, Jr. Company.

On motion made to the Court in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, by Mr. D. F. Rosenthal, leave was granted to file a substituted petition in this case.

John James Jackson, William A. Wilson, Christopher R. Shotton, et al.,
Petitioners,
103 vs.
Steamship "Archimedes," Lamport & Holt Line, Ltd., claimant.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Barry Mohun, in behalf of Mr. Frederic R. Coudert and Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, counsel for the British Embassy, leave was granted to file a brief of the British Embassy, as amicus curiae in this case, and the motion for oral argument was submitted.

Owen P. Smith, Geo. Sawyer, Martin J. Hyland, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
81 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. A. O. Stanley for the plaintiffs in error, this case was passed until December 6.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1927 - CONTINUED.

The State of Louisiana,
Complainant,
9, Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Robert Ash of counsel for the complainant, to open, file, and publish testimony in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. E. Byram, Mark W. Potter, and Edward J. Brundage, as Receivers, etc., Appellants,
501 vs.
A. C. Misty, Chris Olson, L. E. Larson, et al., etc., et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Ober, Jr., in behalf of counsel for the appellants,

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Ry. Company, Plaintiff in error,
615 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.
The Staten Island Rapid Transit Ry. Company, et al. Plaintiffs in error,
616 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence M. Lewis for the defendant in error.

L. P. Larson, Jr., Company, Petitioner,
603 vs.
Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Mr. George S. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Isaac H. Mayer and Mr. Wallace B. Lane for the respondent.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
605 vs.
Ohio River Gravel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, Mr. D. H. Hill Arnold, Mr. George F. Cushwa, and Mr. R. H. Yeatman for the petitioner.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
606 vs.
Ohio River Gravel Company and
Zebedee Westfall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, Mr. D. H. Hill Arnold, Mr. George F. Cushwa, and Mr. R. H. Yeatman for the petitioner, and by Mr. U. G. Young and Mr. J. C. McWhorter for the respondents.

Benzo Gas Motor Fuel Company,
Petitioner,
608 vs.
The National Refining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry L. McCune for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. H. Hogsett and Mr. I. J. Ringolsky for the respondent.

Louisiana Railway & Navigation Company, Petitioner,
609 vs.
Walter McGlory.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. H. Randolph for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

E. M. Jones Burget,

Plaintiff in error,

161 vs.

The Borough of Dormont, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

In error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the eleventh rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Natchez,

Appellants,

94 vs.

S. B. McNeeley and Mrs. Louisia McNeeley, Administratrix, etc., Mrs. Louisia McNeeley, Administratrix of the Estate of S. B. McNeeley, deceased,

Appellant,

108 vs.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Natchez.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Brunini for the Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Natchez. No brief was filed for McNeeley.

United Fuel Gas Company,

Appellant,

79 vs.

The Public Service Commission of West Virginia, I. Wade Coffman, and C. E. Nethken, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Robert S. Spilman for the appellees, and conluded by Mr. F. M. Livezey for the appellees.

The United Fuel Gas Company, a corporation, and Warfield Natural Gas Company, a corporation,

Appellants,

19 vs.

The Railroad Commission of Kentucky, Frank N. Burns, et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants, and by Mr. John T. Diederich for the appellees.

Commercial National Bank of Miles City, Montana, and W. M. Turner, Receiver, etc.,

Plaintiffs in error,

82 vs.

Custer County and John E. deCarle, as County Treasurer of the County of Custer.

W. M. Turner, Receiver of the Commercial National Bank of Miles City, Montana, and Commercial National Bank of Miles City, Montana,

Plaintiffs in error,

83 vs.

Custer County and John E. deCarle, as County Treasurer of the County of Custer.

Miles City National Bank of Miles City, Montana,

Plaintiffs in error,

84 vs.

Custer County and John E. deCarle, as County Treasurer of the County of Custer.

These cases were argued by Mr. C. H. Loud for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Rudolph Nelstead and Mr. A. H. Angstman for the defendants in error.

Commercial National Bank of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for itself and for and on behalf of its shareholders, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
86 vs.
George A. Burke, as County Auditor of Pottawattamie County, Iowa, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George S. Wright for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

E. Paul Yaselli,
Petitioner,
87 vs.
Guy D. Goff.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. E. L. Miller for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Petrus Peterson, It is ordered that Charles R. Wilke, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton Brylawski, It is ordered that Samuel D. Cohen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Archibald A. Gillis, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Ivan Kelso, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Graupner, It is ordered that John L. Young, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
98 vs.
K. S. Leitch.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Douglas W. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Holt, Mr. George B. Martin, and Mr. Rufus S. Dinkle for the respondent.

E. Paul Yaselli, Petitioner,
87 vs.
Guy D. Goff.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. S. Lawrence Miller for the petitioner, by Mr. James M. Beck for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. J. Harlin O'Connell for the respondent.

E. W. Bliss Company, Petitioner,
89 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. William B. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

E. W. Bliss Company, Petitioner,
89 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further findings, with leave to counsel to enter into a stipulation as to the form of judgment to be entered in the Court of Claims.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this

See order pending judgment. p.378

International-Great Northern Railroad Company and Ewing Norwood and A. F. Fisher, Plaintiffs in error,
90 vs.
Railroad Commission of Texas.

This case was argued by Mr. W. L. Cook for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. D. A. Simmons for the defendant in error.

Standard Oil Company and Claude E. Shamp, Plaintiffs in error,
91 vs.
City of Lincoln, Frank C. Zehrung, John Wright, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William H. Herdman for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Frank Andrade, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. LeRoy L. Hight, It is ordered that Maxwell E. McDowell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James K. Symmers, It is ordered that John C. Crawley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank Nigro
600 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, This case was reassigned for argument on January 9, 1928.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas,
Petitioner,
104 vs.
J. H. King.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander H. McKnight, Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, and Mr. Charles C. Huff for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. A. Davies for the respondent.

Standard Oil Company and Claude E. Shamp, Plaintiffs in error,
91 vs.
City of Lincoln, Frank C. Zehrung, John Wright, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. L. A. Flansburg for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Francis Powers, as Administrator of the Estate of Ann Powers, deceased, and Maurice Powers,
Plaintiffs in error,
93 vs.
Joseph Komposh.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Hugh H. Obear for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company,
Appellant,
95 vs.
The United States of America and J. K. Dering Coal Company.

This case was argued by Mr. George B. Gillespie for the appellant, by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, and by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Josephine Stipcich
97 vs.
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Chester I. Long for Stipcith, and by Mr. F. K. Boland for the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace R. Lamb, It is ordered that Porter R. Chandler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Washington Bowie, Jr., It is ordered that H. Gardner Hudson and Alfred Eugene Holton, Esquires, of Winston-Salem, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that A. M. Pepper, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Bride, It is ordered that John Barnett Harshman, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Anthony J. Griffin, It is ordered that Leo Thomas, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Ross Mathis, Esquire, of Cotton Plant, State of Arkansas, J. G. Burke, Esquire, of Helena, State of Arkansas, and De Witt Poe, Esquire, of Arkansas City, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice G. Roberts, It is ordered that Floyd E. Jacobs, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, It is ordered that Robert J. Folonie, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Frank J. Wideman, Esquire, of West Palm Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Clifford, It is ordered that Joseph Bradford Coolidge, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Woolsey, It is ordered that George C. Denneny, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and Frederic Rockwell SanBorn, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. The State of Florida, ex rel. R. Hudson Burr, A. S. Wells, et al., etc.

128 — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. T. W. Davis, on behalf of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The State of Florida, ex rel., R. Hudson Burr, A. S. Wells, et al., etc.

129 — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. T. W. Davis, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richmond Screw Anchor Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
99 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles Evans Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
100 vs.
Mary I. Aeby.

This case was argued by Mr. Merrit U. Hayden for the petitioner, and by Mr. Patrick H. Cullen for the respondent.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
102 vs.
George Flint, Samuel W. Collins,
and Ludwig T. Brehm, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. James K. Symmers and Mr. John C. Crawley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondents.

John James Jackson, William A. Wilson,
Christopher R. Shotton, et al.,
Petitioners,
103 vs.
Steamship "Archimedes," Lamport &
Holt Line, Ltd., claimant.

Leave was granted to counsel for the British Embassy to argue orally. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the petitioners, continued by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent, by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the British Embassy in the United States of America, as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court, and concluded by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the petitioners.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of
Maryland, Plaintiff in error,
105 vs.
State of North Carolina on the
relation of W. D. Smith.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. G. Hudson for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bird J. Vincent, It is ordered that Vincent Daniel Gorman, Esquire, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Darby, It is ordered that C. Paul Parker, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Broussard, It is ordered that Lewell C. Butler, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, It is ordered that Ewald Edward Selph, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George Welch and Jackoline Welch, Plaintiffs in error,
125 vs.
Waddell Investment Company.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. B. A. Lewis for the defendant in error.

United States Steel Products Company, claimant and owner of S. S. "Steel Trader", et al., Petitioners,
106 vs.
Donald J. Adams.

This case was argued by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the respondent.

S. S. Kresge Company, Plaintiff in error,
109 vs.
City of Dayton, Ohio, and Gustav A. Niehus, Chief Inspector, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. J. B. Coolidge for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. John B. Harshman for the defendants in error.

Aetna Insurance Company, Agricultural Insurance Company, Alliance Insurance Company of Philadelphia, et al., Petitioners,
112 vs.
Ben C. Hyde, Superintendent of the Insurance Department of the State of Missouri.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioners, and by Mr. John T. Barker and Mr. Floyd E. Jacobs for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner,
113 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Reid, It is ordered that Demetrius A. Tasiopoulos, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett W. Mattoon, It is ordered that W. Sumner Holbrook, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., It is ordered that Edwin A. Lucas, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer, It is ordered that Morris P. Schaffer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Mexico,

Complainant,

2, Orignal.

The State of Texas.

ORDER

Bill Dismissed and decree directed under cross bill. The Boundary line to be surveyed and marked by a commissioner or commissioners to be appointed by the Court, whose report shall be subject to its approval. The parties may submit within 40 days the form of a decree to carry these conclusions into effect.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

James W. Bothwell, William J. Michel, et al., Receivers of Employers Mutual Insurance and Service Company,

Petitioners,

169 vs.

Buckge, Mears Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

H. E. Byram, Mark W. Potter and Edward J. Brundage, as Receivers, etc., Appellants,

501 vs.

A. G. Risty, Chris Olson, L. E. Larson, et al., etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 20th, next.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
615 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company and The Staten Island Railway Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
616 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 27th, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Natchez,
Appellants,
94 vs.
S. B. McMeeley and Mrs. Louisia McMeeley, Administratrix, etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Mrs. Louisia McNeely, Administratrix of the Estate of S. B. McNeely, deceased, Appellant, vs. Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Natchez. 108 — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Commercial National Bank of Miles City, Montana, and W. M. Turner, Receiver, etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Custer County and John E. deCarle, as County Treasurer of the County of Custer. 82 — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the said cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

W. M. Turner, Receiver of the
Commercial National Bank of
Miles City, Montana, and Commercial
National Bank of Miles City,
Montana, Plaintiffs in error,
83 vs.
Custer County and John E. deCarle,
as County Treasurer of the County
of Custer, Montana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the said cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Miles City National Bank of Miles
City, Montana,
Plaintiff in error,
84 vs.
Custer County and John E. deCarle,
as County Treasurer of the County
of Custer.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the said cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this

Commercial National Bank of
Council Bluffs, Iowa, for itself
and for and on behalf of its
shareholders, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
86 vs.
George A. Burke, as County Auditor
of Pottawattamie County, Iowa, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

E. Paul Yaselli,
Petitioner,
87 vs.
Guy D. Goff.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company and Ewing Norwood and A. F. Fisher, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Railroad Commission of Texas. — In error to the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

90

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Standard Oil Company and Claude E. Shamp, Plaintiffs in error, vs. City of Lincoln, Frank C. Zehrung, John Wright, et al. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

91

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad
Company of Texas,
Petitioner,
104 vs.
J. H. King.

In error to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the said cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Francis Powers, as Administrator of
the Estate of Ann Powers, deceased
and Maurice Powers,
Plaintiffs in error,
93 vs.
Joseph Komposh.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of
Maryland, Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
105 vs. State of North Carolina.
State of North Carolina on the
realtion of W. D. Smith.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

S. S. Kresge Company,
Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
109 vs. State of Ohio.
City of Dayton, Ohio, and Gustav A.
Niehus, Chief Inspector, etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

George Welch and Jackoline Welch, In error to the Supreme Court of the
Plaintiffs in error, State of Oklahoma.
125 vs.
Waddell Investment Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morimura, Arai & Co.,
Petitioner,
597 vs.
Nathan Taback and Louis Taback, individually and as co-partners trading as Taback Brothers.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. P. Larson, Jr., Company,
Petitioner,
603 vs.
Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. And it is further ordered that the questions to be reexamined shall be limited to those relating to the deductions of federal income and excess profits taxes from the net profits awarded to the petitioner.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
605 vs.
Ohio River Gravel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
606 vs.
Ohio River Gravel Company and
Zebedee Westfall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benzo Gas Motor Fuel Company,
Petitioner,
608 vs.
The National Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana Railway & Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
609 vs.
Walter McGlory.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order.

O R D E R

The Court will take a recess from Monday, December 12th until Tuesday, January 3rd, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
613 vs.
The State of Russia.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
614 vs.
The State of Russia.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, for the petitioner, leave was granted to file a reply brief within three days.

Isaac G. Johnson & Company,
Petitioner,
601 vs.
People of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Jay McKelvey, Mr. Morgan J. O'Brien, and Mr. Martin Conboy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert Ottinger for the respondent.

Antonio Fantauzzi,
Petitioner,
602 vs.
Jose Esteban Garcia, a minor by his mother, Jacinta Garcia y Torrendell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis E. Neagle for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. B. Wilcox for the respondent.

Fannie D. Lake, Fred W. Lake, A. F. Lake, and E. D. Lake, Petitioners,
604 vs.
Central Savings Bank of Oakland.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Reach for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. M. Fitzgerald and Mr. Chas. A. Beardsley for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
613 vs.
The State of Russia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Boston, Mr. George S. Hobart, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Mr. Hartwell Cabell, Mr. Mahlon B. Doing, and Mr. Blaine F. Sturgis for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
614 vs.
The State of Russia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Boston, Mr. George S. Hobart, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Mr. Hartwell Cabell, Mr. Mahlon B. Doing, and Mr. Blaine F. Sturgis for the respondent.

Joseph V. Zottarelli and Nicola Salupo, Petitioners,
617 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Breitenstein for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

C. A. Wenstrand,
Petitioner,
618 vs.
The United States of America.

D. A. Wenstrand,
Petitioner,
619 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas S. Allen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The United States of America, as Owner of the Steam Collier "Proteus,"
Petitioner,
620 vs.
Commonwealth and Dominion Line, Ltd. as Owner of the Steamship "Port Philip."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Allan B. A. Bradley and Mr. George De Forest Lord for the respondent.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Joseph Y. Saunders.
No.—, Original.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Y. Saunders pro se.

Bacon Service Corporation,
Plaintiff in error,
127 vs.
Fred C. Huss, as Captain of the Fresno County Traffic Squad.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jeremiah F. Sullivan for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. U. S. Webb and Mr. Frank L. Guerena for the defendant in error.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner,
113 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

N. & G. Taylor Co., Inc., Petitioner,
114 vs.
John A. Anderson and C. A. Gustafson, copartners.

This case was argued by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr. for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hobart P. Young for the respondents.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner,
115 vs.
Loi Hoa.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and the case submitted by Mr. George W. Hott for the respondents.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner,
116 vs.
Lam Young, for and on behalf of Phuong Con.

Daniel V. Harkin and Union Bank of Chicago, Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
117 vs.
Edward J. Brundage, Receiver, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Lloyd C. Whitman for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that Robert E. Bowling, Esquire, of Pauls Valley, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Frank L. Sadoski, Edward J. McGinnis, Carl E. Abrahamson, and Fracis B. Allegretti, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin M. Golder, It is ordered that Jeanette Willensky, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd, It is ordered that John T. O'Donnell, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court; and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Kerkam, It is ordered that Ira Leston Nickerson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Mauro, It is ordered that Henry E. Stauffer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Doyle, It is ordered that A. Stanley DeNeale, Cornelius H. Doherty, and Frederick A. Thuee, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Graupner, It is ordered that J. Rech Guckes, Esquires, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that Edward Clark Kemp, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Daniel V. Harkin and Union Bank of Chicago, Receivers, etc., Petitioners,

117 vs.

Edward J. Brundage, Receiver, etc.,

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Edward R. Johnston for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
119 vs.
Rosenberg Brothers & Company.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
120 vs.
California Wine Association.
United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
121 vs.
S. L. Jones & Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John C. Prizer in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Jacob Telfair Smith and Catz American Shipping Co., as amici curiae in these cases. These cases were argued by Mr. Channcey C. Parker for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Mannon, Jr., for the respondents.

Leo L. Spears,
Plaintiff in error,
122 vs.
The State Board of Medical Examiners of the State of Colorado.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Albert L. Vogl for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Henry Hunter,
Plaintiff in error,
599 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

This case was argued by Mr. Lewell C. Butler for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Aubrey M. Pyburn for the defendant in error.

Ingram-Day Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
126 vs.
Sydney C. McLouth, Revived against The American Loan & Trust Company, Administrator of the Estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William J. Shaw for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Spencer Gordon, It is ordered that Vernon E. Stenersen and Halvor L. Halvorson, Esquires, of Minot, State of North Dakota, William Merrick Parker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Hiram B. Calkins, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Boyd, It is ordered that Gustave Miller, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. E. Wellford, It is ordered that John P. Labofish, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Combs, Jr., It is ordered that James N. Beery, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that George Sergeant, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Reed F. Cutler, Esquire, of Lewistown, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ivan P. Tashof, It is ordered that Harry C. Bierman, Esquire, of New Rochelle, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Huddleston, It is ordered that George Lewis Bailes, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Orliv H. Graves, It is ordered that A. L. Emery, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that E. Smythe Gambrell, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles G. Edwards, It is ordered that Edward Brenman, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that Cicero I. Murray, Esquire, of Lindsay, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ingram-Day Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
126 vs.
Sydney C. McLouth, Revived against
The American Loan & Trust Company,
Administrator of the Estate of
Sydney C. McLouth, deceased.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William J. Shaw for the petitioner, by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Ferris J. Stone for the petitioner.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knauth, Nachod & Kuhne,
Petitioner,
130 vs.
The First National Bank of
Trinidad, Colorado.

This case was argued by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Trosk for the respondent.

Owen P. Smith, Geo. Sawyer, Martin J. Hyland, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
81 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky, Frank E. Daugherty, Attorney General, and
Orie S. Ware, Commonwealth Attorney.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. A. O. Stanley for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Prpclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maximilian M. Stallman, It is ordered that Harry Kalisch, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Leo O. Cox, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Robert Ewing Thomason, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, It is ordered that Conover English, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic M. Sackett, It is ordered that Henry J. Stites, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Herbert S. Sawyer, Esquire, of Sarasota, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, It is ordered that Franklin A. Miller, Esquire, of St. Anthony, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward B. Dunford, It is ordered that Walter A. Rice, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Owen P. Smith, Geo. Sawyer, Martin J. Hyland, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
81 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky, Frank E. Daugherty, Attorney General, and Orie S. Ware, Commonwealth Attorney.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Orie S. Ware for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. A. O. Stanley for the plaintiffs in error.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President under Transportation Act of 1920, Petitioner,
131 vs.
Edward Goodyear, as Administrator of the Estate of Lewis Goodyear, deceased.

This case was argued by Mr. Luther Burns for the petitioner, and the case submitted by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg and Mr. John P. McClure for the respondent.

Ed W. Hopkins, Assessor of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, E. M. Ross, Deputy Assessor, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

133 vs.

Southern California Telephone Company and The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company.

This case was argued by Mr. W. Sumner Holbrook, Jr., and Mr. Everett W. Mattoon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alfred Sutro for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles G. Edwards, It is ordered that E. Ormonde Hunter, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton K. Wheeler, It is ordered that Walter L. Pope, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles Thomason, J. O. Neill, J. W. Eatman, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
135 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.

On the suggestion of the death of J. O. Neill, one of the parties plaintiff in error in this cause, It is now here ordered that Lena Neill, surviving widow, and Joseph E. Neill, George Neill, J. O. Neill, Jr., Sam Neill, and Carey Neill, children of J. O. Neill, deceased, be substituted as parties plaintiffs in error in this cause on motion of Mr. Cicero L. Murray in that behalf.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

I. J. Gordon, B. M. Luton, E. F. Reed, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
134 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.
Charles Thomason, Lena Neill, surviving widow, et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
135 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Cicero I. Murray for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

I. J. Gordon, B. M. Luton, B. F. Reed, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
134 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

I. J. Gordon, B. M. Luton, B. F. Reed, et al.,
Petitioners,
134 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.

On application for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the application for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Thomason, Lena Neill,
surviving widow, etc., et al.,
etc., Plaintiffs in error,
135 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Charles Thomason, Lena Neill,
surviving widow etc., et al.,
etc., Plaintiffs in error,
135 vs.
W. T. Rawleigh Company

On application for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the application for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. C. Lenton, H. M. Wilson, and
E. H. Ray, Plaintiffs in error,
138 vs.
The Union National Bank of Minot.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. L. Halverson for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

F. C. Lenton, H. M. Wilson, and
E. H. Ray, Plaintiffs in error,
138 vs.
The Union National Bank of Minot.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

F. C. Lenton, H. M. Wilson, and
E. H. Ray, Plaintiffs in error,
138 vs.
The Union National Bank of Minot.

On application for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

On consideration of the application for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter W. Pierce et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
145 vs.
Obion County, for use, etc., and
Mercantile Trust Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas H. Malone for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Charles Claflin Allen, Jr., for the defendants in error.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1927 - CONTINUED.

Jay A. Larkin,
Plaintiff in error,
137 vs.
E. H. Pugh and Lincoln Safe Deposit Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Jay A. Larkin, pro se. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Jay A. Larkin,
Plaintiff in error,
137 vs.
E. H. Pugh and Lincoln Safe Deposit Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Jay A. Larkin,
Petitioner
137 vs.
E. H. Pugh and Lincoln Safe Deposit Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The application herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the application shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jay A. Larkin,
Petitioner,
137 vs.
E. H. Pugh and Lincoln Safe Deposit Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Jay A. Larkin, pro se, and concluded by Mr. Karl J. Knoepfler for the respondent.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1927

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that Robert H. Anderson, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl Fenning, It is ordered that John F. Oberlin, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that Robert Black, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Doyle, It is ordered that William Joseph Hogan, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Harry B. Chambers, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Charles Oechler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund B. Quigsle, It is ordered that Herbert R. Kaus, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush L. Holland, It is ordered that Jesse L. England, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Dickstein, It is ordered that Samuel L. Marcus, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Virgil M. Chapman, It is ordered that John O. Bigelow, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that May T. Bigelow, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Leonidas B. McIlhenny, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Shamel, It is ordered that Rufus M. Potts, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that John L. Carter, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, It is ordered that George D. Casto, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Irvine L. Lenroot, It is ordered that Eliot C. Lovett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that Frank P. Darin, Esquire, of River Rouge,, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Rosario Gambino and Joseph Lima,
Petitioners,
226 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the

Northern District of New York, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Robins Dry Dock & Repair Company,

Petitioner,

vs.

George Flint, Samuel W. Collins, and Ludwig T. Brehm, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Joseph Y. Saunders.
No. ——, Original.

On consideration of the petition herein for a writ of mandamus against R. W. Walker, Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit,

It is now here ordered that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis be, and the same is hereby, denied, for the reason that the affidavit in forma pauperis does not show that the party making the motion is

a poor person within the meaning of the act of June 25, 1910 (c.435, 36 Stat. 866). The costs already incurred herein by direction of the Court shall be paid by the Clerk form the Special Fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 27 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John P. Donnelley
110 vs.
The United States of America.
Josephine Stipcich,
97 vs.
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

It is now here ordered that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument and they are hereby assigned for hearing on Monday, January 16, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas J. Casey,
Petitioner,
500 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered that this criminal case upon the docket be advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 9 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway
Company, Petitioner, In error to the Supreme Court of
98 vs. Appeals of the State of West Virginia.
K. S. Leitch.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Bacon Service Corporation,
Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
127 vs. State of California.
Fred C. Huss, as Captain of the
Fresno County Traffic Squad.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Bacon Service Corporation,
Petitioner, On application for writ of certiorari
127 vs. to the Supreme Court of the State
Fred C. Huss, as Captain of the of California.
Fresno County Traffic Squad.

On consideration of the application for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leo L. Spears,

Plaintiff in error,

122 vs.

The State Board of Medical Examiners of the State of Colorado.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Henry Hunter,

Plaintiff in error,

599 vs.

The State of Louisiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Owen P. Smith, Geo. Sawyer, Martin J. Hyland, et al., Plaintiffs in error,

81 vs.

Commonwealth of Kentucky, Frank E. Daugherty, Attorney General, and Orie S. Ware, Commonwealth Attorney.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Walter W. Pierce, M. A. Gaulden, Howard Gaulden, et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Obion County for use, etc., and Mercantile Trust Company. 145

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America, as Owner of the Steam Collier "Proteus", Petitioner, vs. Commonwealth and Dominion Line, Ltd., as Owner of the Steamship "Port Philip". 620

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. And it is further ordered that the discussion shall be limited to the question of the allowance of interest on the amount of the recovery, the consideration thereof to await the decision of this Court in the case of Boston Sand & Gravel Co. vs. The United States, No. 551, October Term, 1927.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isaac G. Johnson & Company,
Petitioner,
601 vs.
People of the State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Antonio Fantauzzi,
Petitioner,
602 vs.
Jose Esteban Garcia, a minor by his mother, Jacinta Garcia y Torrendell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fannie D. Lake, Fred W. Lake, A. F. Lake, and E. D. Lake,
Petitioners,
604 vs.
Central Savings Bank of Oakland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The State of Russia. 613

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The State of Russia. 614

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph V. Zottarelli and Nicola Salupo, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 617

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. Wenstrand,
Petitioner,
618 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is here, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. A. Wenstrand,
Petitioner,
619 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. W. Bliss Company,
Petitioner,
89 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

The judgment and order entered herein on November 29, 1927, is hereby revoked, and the following is now substituted in its stead:

This Court is of opinion that the Secretary of the Navy had authority to make further contracts to pay the petitioner the increased cost resulting from the wage increases put into effect at the Secretary's instance, in the course of the petitioner's performance of the original contracts, and that the findings of the Court of Claims show that such further contracts were made and were based upon an adequate consideration, consisting of both advantage to the Government and detriment to the petitioner. The findings

on other points are not such as to enable this Court finally to dispose of the case.

Accordingly, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims with directions (1) to make further findings (a) as to whether the instruments of release express the actual intention of the parties in respect of a settlement or release of the petitioner's claim for increased cost resulting from putting into effect the increased wages, or whether through mutual mistake, duress or other sufficient ground for reformation the instruments of release were so drawn and signed that they failed to express the actual intention of the parties in that respect, and (b) as to what amount of increased cost to the petitioner resulted from the wage increases as respects work done under the original contracts after the wage increases took effect; (2) to make these findings from the evidence already taken and any additional evidence which the Court of Claims may deem it proper to receive; (3) to allow any amendments of the pleadings which may be needed to present the question whether the instruments of release should be reformed to express the actual intention of the parties in the particular herein named; and (4) to render such judgment in the cause as may be appropriate in view of the amended pleadings and the supplemented findings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Milton E. Springer, Dalmacio Costas, and Anselmo Hilario,
Petitioners,
564 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands;
Gregorio Agoncillo, Baldomero Roxas, and Catalino Lavadia,
Petitioners,
573 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission and Forth Smith, Subinco & Rock Island Railroad Company, Appellants, 607 vs. Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellants.
The United States of America, 610 vs. The John Barth Company and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States.
W. T. Irwin, Sherman & Ellis, Inc., Heco Envelope Co., et al., Petitioners, 361 vs. The Missouri Valley Bridge & Iron Co.	The motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing out of time in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Reed in behalf of counsel for the petitioners.
Must Hatch Incubator Co., Inc., Appellant, 634 vs. I. L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon, I. H. Van Winkle, Attorney General of the State of Oregon, W. H. Lytle, etc.	The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Harris in that behalf.
The State of Colorado, Complainant, ——, Original. vs. The State of Kansas and The Finney County Water Users' Association, a corporation.	The motion for leave to file the bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Boatright for the complainant.

The State of Wisconsin,
Complainant,
7 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motion for extension of time within which to file briefs in support of exceptions to the report of the Special Master herein, submitted by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of the Attorneys General of the States of New York and Wisconsin.

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, pending such further order as this Court may enter hereafter respecting the filing of briefs herein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of New York,
Complainant,
12 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the motion for extension of time within which to file briefs in support of exceptions to the report of the Special Master herein, submitted by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of the Attorneys General of the States of New York and Wisconsin,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, pending such further order as this Court may enter hereafter respecting the filing of briefs herein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
113 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Paul E. Lesh, leave was granted to file an additional brief of the respondent within three days.

Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Columbia, South Carolina,
Petitioner,
456 vs.
Chas. S. Mitchell, W. E. Richardson, Truckers Supply Company, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. W. Robinson for the petitioner.

Bonded Products Corporation,
Petitioner,
621 vs.
The Andrew Jergens Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the UnitedStates Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. P. Bachman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter A. DeCamp and Mr. Edward S. Rogers for the respondent.

William P. Deppe and Deppe Motors Corporation, Petitioners,
622 vs.
General Motors Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submittedto the consideration of the Court by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the petitioners, and by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, and Mr. J. L. Stackpole for the respondent.

Charles Warner Company,
Petitioner,
623 vs.
Independent Pier Company.
Charles Warner Company,
Petitioner,
624 vs.
Steamship "Gulftrade", whereof Gulf Refining Company is claimant.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. T. Manning for the petitioner.

Northern Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
625 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Bunn, Mr. Dennis F. Lyons, Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, and Mr. John S. Flannery for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. J. Farrell for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday, January 3 next at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harlan Wood, It is ordered that Charles L. Carson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace L. Lohnes, It is ordered that James P. Burns, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, It is ordered that Herbert Baruch, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Barbour, It is ordered that John S Rixey and Cleaton E. Rabey, Esquires, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that James H. Baker, Esquire, of Adrian, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Puller, It is ordered that Henry H. Furth, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ingram-Day Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
126 vs.
Sydney C. McLouth, Revived against
The American Loan and Trust Company,
Administrator of the Estate of
Sydney C. McLouth, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, the petitioner herein to recover of and from the respondent the sum of $42,789.96, with costs, and interest from the date of judgment in the District Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner, vs. Loi Hoa. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

115

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco, Petitioner, vs. Lam Young, for and on behalf of Phuong Con. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

116

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

John H. Roche,
Plaintiff in error,
38 vs.
D. K. McDonald.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

John H. Roche,
Petitioner,
38 vs.
D. K. McDonald.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

John H. Roche,
Petitioner,
38 vs.
D. K. McDonald.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington for further

proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. W. F. Wells. 39

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent designated by the President, Petitioner, vs. Arkansas Land and Lumber Company. 73

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

John James Jackson, William A. Wilson, Christopher R. Shotton, et al., Petitioners, vs. Steamship "Archimedes", Lamport and Holt Line, Ltd., Claimant. 103

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Mary I. Aeby. 100

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

H. G. Taylor Co., Inc.,

Petitioner,

114 vs.

John A. Anderson and C. A. Gustafson, doing business under the name of Anderson and Gustafson, copartners.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Aetna Insurance Company, Agricultural Insurance Company, Alliance Insurance Company of Philadelphia, et al., Petitioners,

112 vs.

Ben C. Hyde, Superintendent of the Insurance Department of the State of Missouri.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause; be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America and J. K. Dering Coal Company.

95

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Western Union Telegraph Company.

113

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

United States Steel Products Company, claimant and owner of S. S. "Steel Trader", et al., Petitioners, vs. Donald J. Adams. 106

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Ed. W. Hopkins, Assessor of the County of Los Angeles, State of California; E. M. Ross, Deputy Assessor, etc; W. O. Welch, Tax Collector, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Southern California Telephone Company and the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company. 133

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

194

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court; and it is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that the petitioner pay all of the costs in this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Knauth, Nachod & Kuhne,.

Petitioner,

130 vs.

The First National Bank of Trinidad, Colorado.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Stone and Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Temco Electric Motor Company,

Petitioner,

37 vs.

Apco Manufacturing Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this

Richmond Screw Anchor Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

99 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for additional findings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America

394 vs.

Glen Murray.

On a certificate and transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska with instructions to reverse the order placing Murray upon probation, and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Frederick A. Cook,
Petitioner,
539 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sutherland took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
——, Original.
The State of Kansas.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, February 20, 1928.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. T. Irwin, Sherman & Ellis, Inc., Heco Envelope Co., et al.,
Petitioners,
361 vs.
The Missouri Valley Bridge & Iron Co.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a rehearing herein, made after the expiration of the twenty-five days within which, under rule 30, the petition ought to have been filed, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. But the Court, after consideration of the full brief filed with the motion and the other briefs considered on the original hearing of the petition for certiorari, again denies the petition.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission and
Fort Smith, Subiaco & Rock Island
Railroad Company,
Appellants,
607 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of
Columbia, South Carolina,
Petitioner,
456 vs.
Chas. S. Mitchell, W. E. Richardson,
Truckers Supply Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justife Taft.

The United States of America,
610 vs.
The John Barth Company and United
States Fidelity and Guaranty
Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Milton E. Springer, Dalmacio Costas, and Anselmo Hilario, Petitioners,
564 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next.

Gregorio Agoncillo, Baldomero Roxas, and Catalino Lavadia, Petitioners,
573 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Must Hatch Incubator Co., Inc., Appellant,
634 vs.
I. L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Warner Company, Petitioner,
623 vs.
Independent Pier Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Warner Company, Petitioner,
624 vs.
Steamship "Gulftrade," whereof Gulf Refining Company is Claimant.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is

certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bonded Products Corporation, Petitioner,
621 vs.
The Andrew Jergens Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William P. Deppe and Deppe Motors Corporation, Petitioner,
622 vs.
General Motors Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
625 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Appellant,
79 vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia, I. Wade Coffman and C. E. Nethken, et al.

The United Fuel Gas Company, a Corporation, and Warfield Natural Gas Company, a Corporation,
Appellants,
19 vs.
The Railroad Commission of Kentucky, Frank M. Burns, et al., etc., and Frank E. Daugherty, Attorney General of Kentucky.

It is now here ordered that these cases be restored to the docket for a reargument, and they are assigned for Monday, February 27th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George McNeir,
Petitioner,
192 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for respondent in this cause, and he having confessed error and having moved the Court to reverse the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said confession of error, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oil Fields Corporation,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
John S. Dashko, T. P. Novick, Olga Novick, et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing out of time under rule 30, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert L. Wilson for the petitioner.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
——, Original. vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest L. Averill for the complainant.

News Syndicate Company
235 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing out of time under rule 30, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Parker McCollester in behalf of the New York Central Railroad Company et al.

The State of Wisconsin et al.,
Complainant,
7 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago et al.

The exceptions to the report of the Special Master in this case were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. T. Jackson in behalf of the States of Wisconsin, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota.

The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.

The exceptions to the report of the Special Master in this case were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilbur M. Brucker in behalf of the State of Michigan.

The State of New York
Complainant,
12, Original.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.

The exceptions to the report of the Special Master herein were submitted to the Court by Mr. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., in behalf of the State of New York.

The State of Wisconsin et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.
The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.
The State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.

On consideration of the suggestions as to filing briefs in the above entitled causes, submitted by Mr. James M. Beck for the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago. It is now here ordered, that counsel for the respective parties in these cases shall, within three days from this date, agree upon such parts of the record as should be printed for the consideration of the exceptions filed to the report of the Special Master; that briefs for all parties filing objections to said report be filed within 30 days from the expiration of the time within which counsel shall agree as to the parts of the record to be printed; and that briefs for the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago be filed within 20 days after the time allowed counsel for the complainants within which to file briefs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
262 vs.
The American Valve and Meter Company et al.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record in this case and motion for a writ of certiorari were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dwight B. Cheever for the petitioners.

The United States of America, ex rel. Neils Peter Clausson, Petitioner,
166 vs.
Honorable Henry H. Curran, Commissioner of Immigration.

The motion to pass this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. L. Lohnes in behalf of Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the petitioner.

Charles S. Green et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing out of time under rule 30, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph L. Tepper in behalf of counsel for the petitioners.

Josephine E. Stipcich
97 vs.
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

The motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. George E. Chamberlain, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, and Mr. G. C. Fulton for Stipcich.

Chicago Cheese and Farm Products Co., Petitioner,
505 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph E. Marron,
Petitioner,
185 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing in this case out of time under rule 30 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus in behalf of Mr. Benjamin L. McKinley for the petitioner.

Milton A. Helms,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett J. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Eastern Coal and Export Corporation,
Petitioner,
627 vs.
Norfolk and Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sherlock Bronson for the petitioner.

Warner Marshall,
Petitioner,
628 vs.
Walter D. Lovell,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Franklin F. Phillips for the petitioner, and by Mr. James D. Shearer for the respondent.

Wm. Wrigley, Jr. Company,
Petitioner,
629 vs.
L. P. Larson, Jr., Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wallace R. Lane and Mr. Isaac H. Mayer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Mr. George I. Haight for the respondent.

The De Laski & Thropp Circular Woven Tire Company,
Petitioner,
632 vs.
Murray Rubber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Haight and Mr. E. Clarkson Seward for the petitioner, and by Mr. Drury W. Cooper and Mr. Luther E. Morrison for the respondent.

Anna Marie Maney,
Petitioner,
636 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin S. Mack and Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Graver Corporation,
Petitioner,
637 vs.
Fred Mansur, Trustee in Bankruptcy of White Star Oil & Refining Company, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. S. Lewis for the petitioner.

New Amsterdam Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
W. T. Taylor Construction Company,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Augustus Benners for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. H. Babaniss for the respondent.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 1928 - CONTINUED.

Alyea-Nichols Company,
Petitioner,
640 vs.
John L. Pickering, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition herein for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Shamel, Mr. Rufus M. Potts, and Mr. Joseph W. Cox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Alyea-Nichols Company,
Petitioner,
641 vs.
The United States of America.

Annie Marie Maney,
Petitioner,
636 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin S. Mack and Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner

W. B. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
660 vs.
Glenn E. Cunningham, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Charles Bury, Bankrupt.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Mitchell, pro se.

Floyd Richardson,
Petitioner,
664 vs.
The State of California.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Floyd Richardson, pro se.

Henry O. Head,
Plaintiff in error,
548 vs.
Obion County, for the use of Houser Creek Drainage District.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed briefs pursuant to stipulation, under the twenty-third rule.

Harry Hawkins, Charles Dawes, Beatrice Peters Schapp, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
454 vs.
Elmer E. Klein, W. A. Moses, J. G. Marcum, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Vern E. Thompson and Mr. C. H. Merillat for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr.C. B. Ames for the plaintiffs in error in opposition thereto.

Swift & Company et al., and Armour & Company, et al.
181 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for Swift & Co. and Armour & Co. et al., and continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, It is ordered that Milton E. Hartley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. J. Dimock, , It is ordered that Benj. Champneys Atlee, Esquire, of Lancaster, State of Pennsylvania, and Eleanor Stuart Burch, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. Clarke Mason, It is ordered that A. Allen Woodruff, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Glen R. Horner, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton, It is ordered that William A. Munlist, Esquire, of New York City, be, admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence F. Lea, It is ordered that J. Harold Weise, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. K. Quinter, It is ordered that Lanier McKee, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Ellis Moore, It is ordered that W. R. Pohle, Esquire, of Cristobal, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

O R D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court that the bond of the Marshal, Frank K. Green, dated January 1, 1928, be, and the same is, this day approved and recorded.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Said bond is in the words and figures as follows: viz:

"Know all men by these presents: That FRANK K. GREEN, of Washington, District of Columbia, as Principal, and THE FIDELITY AND CASUALTY COMPANY OF NEW YORK, as Surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America in the penal sum of TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($20,000.00), lawful money of the United States to be paid to the said United States, or their certain attorney, which payment well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

SEALED with our seals and dated this first day of January, 1928.

WHEREAS, the above bounden FRANK K. GREEN, hath been appointed Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States;

NOW, THEREFORE, the condition of the above obligation is such that if the said FRANK K. GREEN shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and shall well and faithfully keep, disburse, pay over and account for according to law, the moneys that may come into his hands as such Marshal aforesaid, then this obligation to be void, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

WITNESSES:

(signed)Jno.G. Urquhart
(signed)Robert F.Stewart

(signed) Frank K. Green SEAL

THE FIDELITY AND CASUALTY COMPANY OF NEW YORK SEAL

(signed) George A. Griffin
By George A. Griffin Attorney.

The within and foregoing bond is hereby approved as to form, the sufficiency of the amount thereof and the sufficiency of the Surety thereon.

(signed) Wm. H. Taft

Chief Justice of the United States.

The State of Wisconsin et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.
The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.
The State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original.
The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the order heretofore entered in these cases on Tuesday, January 3, be, and it is hereby, amended to provide as follows: Counsel for the complainants filing exceptions to the report of the Special Master shall indicate in narrative form within 10 days from this date such parts of the record as they deem necessary to support their exceptions, such designated narrative to be served upon counsel for the respondents, who shall within 10 days thereafter indicate in narrative form such additional parts of the record as they deem necessary. The joint abstract of the parts of the record to be printed in narrative form shall be filed with the Clerk of this Court within 20 days from this date and shall be printed under his supervision. Briefs for the complainants filing exceptions to the report of the Special Master shall be filed within 20 days from the expiration of the time allowed for filing the joint abstract of record. Briefs for the respondents shall be filed within 15 days after the expiration of the time allowed complainants within which to file briefs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Swift & Company, et al. and
Armour & Company et al.,
181 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William C. Breed for the National Wholesale Grocers Ass'n., and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for Swift & Co., et al.

Arthur C. Brown 33 vs. The United States of America.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert N. Golding for Brown. The Court declined to hear further argument.
John A. Crosfield and Richard Caplis 62 vs. The United States of America.	This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States, and the case submitted by Mr. Harold Goodman and Mr. Edwin Monnig for Crosfield and Caplis.
The United States, Petitioner, 283 vs. Magnolia Petroleum Company et al., etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Barry Mohun for the respondents.
Arnold J. Hellmich, collector, etc., Petitioner, 299 vs. Isadore N. Hellman.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Henry H. Furth for the respondents.
Arnold J. Hellmich, collector, etc., Petitioner, 300 vs. Milton C. Hellman.	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Dunbar, It is ordered that Tom W. Holman, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Spencer Gordon, It is ordered that Kenneth M. Fiske, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Jeannette Willensky, It is ordered that Louis B. Davidson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward W. Shepard, It is ordered that John E. Jackson, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar, It is ordered that Smith B. Atwood, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Miller & Lux, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
148 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California et al.

This case was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector, etc.,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Isadore N. Hellman.
Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector, etc.,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
Milton C. Hellman.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Henry H. Furth for the respondents.

James C. Colgate,
Appellant,
592 vs.
Philadelphia Electric Power Co. et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. E. J. Dimmock for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co., Petitioner,
141 vs.
John Rellstab, Judge, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. M. M. Stallman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry Kalisch for the respondents.

James W. Wuchter, Plaintiff in error,
142 vs.
Michael Pizzutti.

This case was argued by Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Jacob R. Mantell for the defendant in error.

Emma Sango, Plaintiff in error,
143 vs.
William Willig.

This case was argued by Mr. William Neff for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. G. R. Horner for the defendant in error.

Eleanor Saltonstall & Lawrence Brooks, Plaintiffs in error,
144 vs.
Leverett Saltonstall et al., Trustees, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas Hunt for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Jessica Dee Stewart and Ralph B. Stewart, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. North T. Gentry, It is ordered that Holland R. Polak, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry M. Low, It is ordered that Russel N. Low, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Harrison M. Brooks, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Connor, It is ordered that Harry M. Peyser, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

United States ex rel. Niels Peter Clausen, Petitioner,
166 vs.
Hon. Henry H. Curran, Commissioner, etc.

Suggestion of abatement was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

John Lapique, successor in interest, etc., Appellant,
158 vs.
Frank E. Walsh, et al., etc.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Lapique, pro se, and by Mr. Herbert J. Goudge for the appellees.

Eleanor Saltonstall & Lawrence Brooks, Plaintiffs in error,
144 vs.
Leverett Saltonstall, et al., Trustees, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Thomas Hunt for the plaintiffs in error, and concluded by Mr. Edwin H. Abbot, Jr., for the defendants in error.

Henry Wilson et al., Petitioners,
146 vs.
Pacific Mail S. S. Co., et al., etc.
Pacific Mail S. S. Co., claimant, etc., et al., Petitioners,
173 vs.
Henry Wilson.

These cases were argued by Mr. Farnham P. Griffiths for the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., et al., and by Mr. Louis T. Hengstler for Wilson et al.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co., Petitioner,
147 vs.
The Town of Morristown et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Corpley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Milton T. Farmer, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Waters, Jr., It is ordered that Ernest C. Dickson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Orie S. Ware, It is ordered that Frank M. Tracy, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that William G. Lynch and Harvey Roney, Esquires, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, It is ordered that Noah A. Stancliffe and William H. Milholland, Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that James D. Shaver, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, It is ordered that Frank H. Ward, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that W. H. Martin, Esquire, of Hot Springs, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Leo L. Spears,

Plaintiff in error,

122 vs.

The State Board of Medical Examiners of the State of Colorado.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing herein, it is now here ordered that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied; but the Court's order of dismissal, entered December 12, 1927, is hereby changed so as to read: "Dismissed because the record does not disclose that any substantial Federal Question was made in the presentation of the cause in the State Supreme Court. McCorquodale v. State of Texas, 211 U.S. 432, 436, 437; Consolidated Turnpike Co. v. Norfolk & Ocean View Ry. Co., 228 U.S. 326, 333, 334; Godchaux Co. v. Estopinal, 251 U.S. 179, 180, 181.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph E. Marron,
Petitioner,
185 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein out of time under rule 30, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

News Syndicate Company,
235 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein out of time under rule 30, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oil Fields Corporation,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
John S. Dashko, T. P. Novick, Olga Novick, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein out of time under rule 30, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna Marie Maney,
Petitioner,
636 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna Marie Maney,
Petitioner,
636 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the Clerk have the record printed forthwith and pay the cost thereof, as well as the costs already incurred herein, from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. B. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
660 vs.
Glenn E. Cunningham, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Charles Rury, Bankrupt.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the Special Fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. B. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
660 vs.
Glenn E. Cunningham, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Charles Rury, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Floyd Richardson,
Petitioner,
664 vs.
The State of California.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Floyd Richardson,
Petitioner,
664 vs.
The State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
——, Original. vs.
The State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, March 5, 1928.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company, and Sheffield Car Company,

Petitioners,

262 vs.

American Valve & Meter Company and Edward E. Johnson.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the parties herein do show cause in printed briefs, if any cause there be, on or before Monday, February 20, 1928, why the decree entered by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause should not be reversed and the cause remanded to that court for further proceedings in conformity with the rulings of this Court recently made in the case of Barber Asphalt Paving Co. v. Standard Asphalt & Rubber Co., No. 194, October Term, 1927, opinion announced January 3, 1928, in reference to the operation of rule 75(b), and to the payment, by way of reimbursement for expenses and counsel fees, occasioned by the fault of one or the other parties herein through the disregard of rule 75 (b).

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Josephine Stipcich,

97 vs.

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the motion to send up the entire record in this cause, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and the Clerk is directed to notify the parties that the order setting the cause for hearing on January 16, 1928, is revoked and the cause is set down for hearing on March 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Hawkins, Charles Dawes, Beatrice Peters Schapp, et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

454 vs.

Elmer E. Klein, W. A. Moses, J. C. Marcum, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and on a motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dis-

Harry Hawkins, Charles Dawes,
Beatrice Peters Schapp, et al.,
Petitioners,
454 vs.
Elmer E. Klein, W. A. Moses, J. G.
Marcum, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry O. Head,
Plaintiff in error,
548 vs.
Obion County, for the use of Houser
Creek Drainage District.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Colgate,
Appellant,
592 vs.
Philadelphia Electric Power Company,
Nathan R. Buller, William D. B.
Ainey, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emma Sango, Plaintiff in error, vs. William Willig. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma

143

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emma Sango, Petitioner, vs. William Willig. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

143

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Lapique, Successor in interest of the Estate of Maria Espiritu Chiljulla De Leonis, etc., Appellant, vs. Frank E. Walsh, Frank E. Walsh, Administrator, etc., Harry L. Dunnigan, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

158

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

The United States of America ex rel.
Niels Peter Clausen,
Petitioner,
166 vs.
Honorable Henry H. Curran,
Commissioner of Immigration.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to abate, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York be, and the same are hereby, vacated, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with direction to dismiss the cause as abated.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry W. McMaster et al.,
Receivers, etc.,
Petitioners,
85 vs.
George J. Gould, et al., Executors,
etc.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the petitioners and respondents in this case do show cause in printed form, if any cause there be, on or before Monday, January 23, 1928, why the writ of certiorari heretofore granted in this case should not be dismissed for want of jurisdiction, on the ground that the decree sought to be reviewed in this Court is not a final decree within the meaning of Section 237 (b) of the Judicial Code, in that it appears that Myron T. Herrick, one of the defendants, has appeared and answered the bill of complaint, and that the cause is still pending as to the said Myron T. Herrick in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and therefore has not been finally and completely determined.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
6, Original. vs.
The State of Texas,
Defendant,
The United States of America,
Intervener.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the complainant in this cause, the State of Oklahoma, the defendant, the State of Texas, and the intervener, the United States of America, do show cause in printed form, if any cause there be, on or before Monday, February 20, 1928, why the decree entered in this cause on January 3, 1927, should not be amended by changing clause 1 thereof so that it shall read as follows:

1. The boundary between the State of Texas and the State of Oklahoma constituting the eastern boundary of the Panhandle of Texas and the main western boundary of Oklahoma, is the line of the true one-hundredth meridian of longitude west from Greenwich, extending north from its intersection with the south bank of the South Fork of Red River to its intersection with the line of the parallel of 36 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, as surveyed and marked by John H. Clark, United States commissioner, under the Act of June 5, 1858, c. 92, which was confirmed as the northern boundary of the State of Texas by the Act of March 3, 1891, c. 542, and by a Joint Resolution of the 22nd Legislature of Texas.

Service of this rule will be made upon the attorneys general of the two States and of the United States/ (Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
respectively.

National Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
228 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered that this cause be assigned for argument on Monday, April 9 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roy Olmstead, Jerry L. Finch, Clarence G. Healy, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 493

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ; the consideration of this cause to be limited, however, to the question whether the use of evidence of private telephone conversations, between the defendants and others, intercepted by means of wire tapping, is a violation of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments and, therefore, not permissible in the Federal courts.

It is further ordered that the order entered herein on November 21, 1927, denying the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, revoked.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles S. Green, Emory A. Kern, A. J. Hendrick, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 532

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ; the consideration of this cause to be limited, however, to the question whether the use of evidence of private telephone conversations, between the defendants and others, intercepted by means of wire tapping, is a violation of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments and, therefore, not permissible in the Federal courts.

It is further ordered that the order entered herein on November 21, 1927, denying the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, revoked.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward H. McInnis,
Petitioner,
533 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ; the consideration of this cause to be limited, however, to the question whether the use of evidence of private telephone conversations, between the defendants and others, intercepted by means of wire tapping, is a violation of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments, and, therefore, not permissible in the Federal Courts.

It is further ordered that the order entered herein on November 21, 1927, denying the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, revoked.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Milton A. Helms,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eastern Coal and Export Corporation, Petitioner,
627 vs.
Norfolk and Western Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Warner Marshall, Petitioner,
628 vs.
Walter D. Lovell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Company, Petitioner,
629 vs.
L. P. Larson, Jr., Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The De Laski & Thropp Circular
Woven Tire Company,
Petitioner,
632 vs.
Murray Rubber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Graver Corporation,
Petitioner,
637 vs.
Fred Mansur, Trustee in Bankruptcy of White Star Oil & Refining Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New Amsterdam Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
W. T. Taylor Construction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Alyea-Nichols Company,

Petitioner,

640 vs.

John L. Pickering, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alyea-Nichols Company,

Petitioner,

641 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico,

Complainant,

2, Original. vs.

The State of Texas.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington for the complainant, the time within which to file form of decree pursuant to the opinion of this Court announced December 5, was extended for twenty days from January 14.

Fred H. Slatmeyer,
Plaintiff in error,
292 vs.
Industrial Commission of Ohio.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Frank H. Ward suggesting the death of Fred H. Slatmeyer, party plaintiff in error in this cause: and he having moved the Court to substitute Arthur E. Hoffman, executor of the estate of Fred H. Slatmeyer, deceased, as the party plaintiff in error in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minnie H. Leach,
Petitioner,
646 vs.
Floyd E. Fischer, Guardian, etc., et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles H. Bates in behalf of counsel for the respondents, leave was granted the respondent to file a brief within two weeks.

Adelaide F. Chapman,
Petitioner,
623 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sanford Robinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Lacquer & Chemical Corporation,
Petitioner,
635 vs.
Chester P. Mills, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis Landes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John T. Byrne for the respondents.

Township of Maplewood,
Petitioner,
644 vs.
Max Margolis.
Township of Maplewood and
Reinhardt O. Osterman, Building
Inspector, etc.,
Petitioners,
645 vs.
Max Margolis.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. P. Bachman for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. M. L. Woodward for the respondents.

The Monument Pottery Company,
Petitioner,
647 vs.
Imperial Coal Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gibbs L. Baker and Mr. Henry Ravenel for the respondent.

W. S. McCray,
Petitioner,
648 vs.
Sapulpa Petroleum Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. E. Riddle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude H. Rosenstein for the respondents.

Olaf Stromland, Didrik Loga, and
Arnold Sorvig, Petitioners,
649 vs.
Mystic Steamship Company, Claimant
on its own behalf and on behalf of
H. D. Babbidge, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Morewitz for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henry H. Little for the respondent.

Mrs. Ruby Inglett Arrington,
Petitioner,
686 vs.
Grand Lodge Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Ruby Inglett Arrington, pro se.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co., Petitioner,
147 vs.
The Town of Morristown et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Conover English for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner.

John C. Denney, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., Appellants,
150 vs.
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.
John C. Denney, as Director of Public Works of Washington, et al., etc., Appellants,
151 vs.
Home Telephone & Telegraph Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Arthur Schramm for the appellants in No. 150, continued by Mr. John H. Dunbar for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Otto B. Rupp for the appellees.

Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co., et al., Appellants,
153 vs.
William T. Lee, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frank W. Gwathmey for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis O. Van Doren, It is ordered that Alfred C. B. McNevin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. H. Phipps, It is ordered that Elvy E. Calloway, Esquire, of Lakeland, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that Sylas S. Meyer, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Moore, It is ordered that John W. Cowell, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that John D. Meyer and William J. Aiken, Esquires, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that John Edgar Harris, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., et al., Appellants,
153 vs.
William T. Lee, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Frank W. Gwathmey for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman for the appellees.

Bryant Arnold, doing business as Kansas City Hay Company, et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error,
155 vs.
Forest Hanna et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., Petitioner,
159 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Spencer Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Toledo, St. Louis & Western R. R. Co., Petitioner,
160 vs.
Hilbert Stuart Allen.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sigmund M. Brandt, It is ordered that Joseph M. Hurt, Jr., Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Theo. T. Turnbull, Esquire, of Monticello, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that N. P. Sims, Esquire, of Bowling Green, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that John J. Danhof, Jr., Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen C. Porter, It is ordered that Homer H. Young, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Katherine Linstead, Executrix, etc., Petitioner,
171 vs.
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Cowell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank M. Tracy for the respondent.

Toledo, St. Louis & Western R.R. Co., Petitioner,
160 vs.
Hilbert Stuart Allen.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Holland R. Polak for the respondent.

Thomas J. Casey, Petitioner,
500 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. John T. Casey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States, (tor Leave granted petitioner to file reply brief on or before Tuesday next.

Frank Nigro
600 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William G. Lynch for Nigro, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Eugie Vaughan Parham, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Kiskaddon, It is ordered that B. F. Batts, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Riordon, It is ordered that Gustav Drews, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnham, It is ordered that James S. Eastham, Esquire, of Methuen, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
179 vs.
L. G. Touchstone.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter S. Welch and Mr. Ellis B. Cooper for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Calvin Wells for the respondent.

Ernest F. Dunham, Plaintiff in error,
180 vs.
Albert Ottinger.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Gordon Battle for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William H. Milholland for the defendant in error.

Frank Migro
600 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States.

Samuel J. Kornhauser, Petitioner,
162 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Arthur H. Lamborn et al., Petitioners,
163 vs.
National Bank of Commerce of Norfolk, Virginia.

This case was argued by Mr. Louis O. Van Doren for the petitioners, and by Mr. Tazewell Taylor for the respondent.

Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, etc., et al., Petitioners,

168 vs.

D. W. Michaux, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harold S. Davis for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Claude Pollard for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Waterg, Jr., It is ordered that Andrew D. Washington, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Houston, It is ordered that Samuel B. Horovitz, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Owen J. Roberts, It is ordered that Roy M. Sterne, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund L. Jones, It is ordered that John May, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that Mario F. Di Troia, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that Charles I. Francis, Esquire, of Whicita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Milton A. Nelms,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to withold the order in this case until the decision in case No. 600 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jos. W. Cox in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Louis K. Liggett Company,
Appellant,
673 vs.
The Honorable Thomas J. Baldrige, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al., etc., et al.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Owen J. Roberts in that behalf.

Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, etc., et al., Petitioners,
168 vs.
D. W. Michaux, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Claude Pollard for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Harold S. Davis for the petitioners.

Finance & Guaranty Co., Petitioner, 170 vs. Henry W. Oppenhimer, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. S. M. Brandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph M. Hurt for the respondent.
Lloyd Littrell, Receiver, etc. Plaintiff in error, 172 vs. Peter G. Cameron, Secretary of Banking of Pennsylvania, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William S. Moorhead for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Black & White Taxicab & Transfer Co., Petitioner, 174 vs. Brown & Yellow Taxicab & Transfer Co.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. N. P. Sims for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that Charles H. Donovan, Esquire, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Needham, It is ordered that Homer H. Kirby, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Julian S. Wooster, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Ellis Moore, It is ordered that C. Tatgenhorst, Jr., Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings, It is ordered that Chas. E. McPherren, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dwight H. Lewis, It is ordered that Stephen Robinson, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Casimir E. Midowicz, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
141 vs.
John Rellstab, Judge of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Milton A. Helms,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to withhold issuing the order denying the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until the decision of this Court in the case of Nigro v. United States, No. 600, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis K. Liggett & Company,
Appellant,
673 vs.
The Honorable Thomas J. Baldrige, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Ruby Inglett Arrington,
Petitioner,
686 vs.
The Grand Lodge of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Mrs. Inglett.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Ruby Inglett Arrington,
Petitioner,
686 vs.
The Grand Lodge of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Mrs. Ethel Inglett.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company and Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Appellants, vs. William T. Lee, George P. Pell, and A. J. Maxwell, as members, etc. et al.

153 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bryant Arnold, doing business as Kansas City Hay Company, C. F. Arnold, H. B. Arnold, et al., etc., et al. Plaintiffs in error, vs. Forest Hanna and C. P. Anderson.

155 In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf, Mobile and Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. L. G. Touchstone. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

179

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest F. Dunham, Plaintiff in error, vs. Albert Ottinger, individually and as Attorney General of the State of New York. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

180

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lloyd Littrell, Receiver of the
First National Bank of Carnegie, Plaintiff in error,
172 vs.
Peter G. Cameron, Secretary of
Banking of Pennsylvania, in
possession of the Carnegie Trust
Company, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville Gas and Electric
Company, Plaintiff in error,
70 vs.
W. H. Shanks, as Auditor of the State
of Kentucky.

It is ordered that this case be restored to the docket and set for re-argument before the full Court on Monday, February 27th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adelaide F. Chapman,
Petitioner,
633 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lacquer & Chemical Corporation,

Petitioner,

635 vs.

Chester P. Mills, Federal Prohibition Administrator for the Second District of New York, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Township of Maplewood,

Petitioner,

644 vs.

Max Margolis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Township of Maplewood and Reinhardt O. Osterman, Building Inspector, etc.,

Petitioner,

645 vs.

Max Margolis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Monument Pottery Company,
Petitioner,
647 vs.
Imperial Coal Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. S. McCray,
Petitioner,
648 vs.
Sapulpa Petroleum Company, Mrs. Dannie Ross Burnett, as Administratrix, Mrs. Dannie Ross Burnett, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Olaf Stromland, Didrik Loga and Arnold Sorvig,
Petitioners,
649 vs.
Mystic Steamship Company, Claimant on its own behalf and on behalf of H. D. Babbidge, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

ORDER

The Court will take a recess from Monday, January 23d, until Monday, February 20th, next.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
194 vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company.

The motion for the mandate in this case was denied.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
2, Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington for the complainant, leave was granted to file a petition for rehearing and supplemental petition for rehearing.

Cora B. Beatty, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of John W. Beatty, deceased,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John C. Buchanan in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of William Watson Smith and John C. Buchanan, as amici curiae, in this case.

Fred M. Kirby,
Petitioner,
184 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Edward Holloway in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Charles E. Hughes, Charles E. F. McCann, William C. Breed, Paul Armitage, and Harrison Tweed, as amici curiae, in this case.

Fred M. Kirby,
Petitioner,
184 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Edward Holloway in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of James E. MacCloskey, Jr., as amicus curiae, in this case.

Standard Oil Company and Claude E. Shamp, Plaintiffs in error,
91 vs.
City of Lincoln, Frank C. Zehrung, John Wright, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Dale D. Drain, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, leave was granted to file a petition for a rehearing out of time in this case.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
98 vs.
K. S. Leitch.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. William Strickland, in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, leave was granted to file a petition for a rehearing out of time in this case.

Roy Olmstead, Jerry L. Finch, Clarence G. Healy, et al.,
Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.
Charles S. Green, Emory A. Kern, A. J. Hendrick, et al.,
Petitioners,
532 vs.
The United States of America.
Edward H. McInnis,
Petitioner,
533 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to reassign these cases, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In re: Herbert Latham Fordham,

Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Robert F. Cogswell to direct the Clerk to change the name of Herbert Latham Fordham on the roll of Attorneys admitted to practice in this Court to "Herbert Fordham",

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minnie H. Leach,

Petitioner,

646 vs.

Floyd E. Fischer, Guardian of the Estates of Eleanor Ann Fischer and Roderick Leadh Fischer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. N. Watson and Mr. R. E. Watson for the petitioner.

Paul Rubio,

Petitioner,

650 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maxwell McNutt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Louise Foster for the respondent.

Thomas Murphy,

Petitioner,

651 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maxwell McNutt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Louise Foster for the respondent.

Irving M. Austin,
Petitioner,
652 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence V. Opper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mrs. K. L. Campbell for the respondent.

Finance & Guaranty Company of Baltimore, Md.,
Petitioner,
656 vs.
Harry C. Stitt, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Graham Glessner and Mr. Leo Oppenheimer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clayton E. Emig for the respondent.

The Lawrence-Williams Company,
Petitioner,
658 vs.
Societe Enfants Combault, et Cie.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Oberlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lanier McKee and Mr. James R. Garfield for the respondent.

The Citizens & Southern Bank,
Petitioner,
661 vs.
Carrie Y. Payram, as Executrix of the Estate of Frederick Payram.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles B. Shelton for the respondent.

Security Mortgage Company,
Petitioner,
662 vs.
Charles A. Powers, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

Walter S. Dillon for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton for the petitioner, and by Mr.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Abraham S. Gilbert
——, Original.

This matter was argued on the return to the rule to show cause by Mr. James M. Beck on behalf of the respondent.

Black & White Taxicab & Transfer Co., Petitioner,
174 vs.
Brown & Yellow Taxicab & Transfer Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. N. P. Sims for the petitioner, and case submitted by Mr. M. M. Logan for the respondent.

Gulf Fisheries Company,
Appellant,
178 vs.
John L. Darrouzet, District & County Attorney, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Brantley Harris for the appellant and by Mr. D. A. Simmons for the appellee.

Corona Cord Tire Co.,
Petitioner,
182 vs.
Dovan Chemical Corporation.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace R. Lamb, It is ordered that John G. Poore, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that J. W. James, Esquire, of Hastings, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that William M. Whittington, Esquire, of Greenwood, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that Robert D. Neely, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, , It is ordered that Horace S. Davis, Esquire, of Billings, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph Harrison,, It is ordered that Frank S. Tavenner, Esquire, of Woodstock, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Wm. H. Griffin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph Harrison, It is ordered that D. O. Dechert, Esquire, of Harrisonburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

V. L. Highland,
Petitioner,
209 vs.
Russell Car & Snow Plow Co.

This case was passed pursuant to the 18th rule, on motion of Mr. August Gutheim for the respondent.

Geo. O. Richardson Machinery Co.,
Petitioner,
198 vs.
Mrs. Annie Scott, Adm'x. etc.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. H. Linebaugh and Mr. Paul Pinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jean H. Everest and Mr. Charles L. Moore for the respondent.

Corona Cord Tire Co.,
Petitioner,
182 vs.
Dovan Chemical Corporation.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds for the petitioner.

Western Union Telegraph Company,
Petitioner,
183 vs.
C. H. Priester.
Western Union Telegraph Company,
189 vs.
C. H. Priester.

These cases were argued by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. M. Powell for the respondent.

Fred M. Kirby,
Petitioner,
184 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Martin A. Schenck for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan L. Strong, It is ordered that Theo. L. Wilson, Esquire, of Clarion, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dwight B. Galt, It is ordered that Elmer Le Grand Goldsmith, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Ford, It is ordered that Edmund Hill, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Fred M. Kirby,

Petitioner,

184 vs.

The United States.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Martin A. Schenck for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

T. Smith & Son, Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
186 vs.
Fannie Robinson Taylor, widow of George Taylor, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. John May for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Eugie V. Parham for the defendant in error.

Fort Smith, Subiaco and Rock Island R. R. Co.,
Petitioner,
187 vs.
Emma Moore, Adm'x. etc.

This case was argued by Mr. James B. McDonough for the petitioner, and case submitted by Emma Moore, pro se.

Bountiful Brick Company, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
193 vs.
Elizabeth W. Giles, as Widow and as Guardian, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Henry D. Moyle for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. S. B. Horovitz for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Minitree J. Fulton, It is ordered that Thomas J. Michie, Jr., Esquire, of Charlottesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John P. Donnelley
110 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was reargued by Mr. Frank H. Noroross for Donnelley, and by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States.

People of Sioux County, Nebraska,
Petitioner,
196 vs.
National Surety Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles S. Lobingier for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin G. Davis for the respondent.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1929 - CONTINUED.

Interstate Busses Corporation,

Appellant,

197 vs.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner,

etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edward H. Kelly for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland, Associate Justices.

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal H. Weller, It is ordered that Honour B. Gelson, of New York City, State of New York ,be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton K. Wheeler, It is ordered that Clarence N. Davidson, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Grace L. Wallace, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Edward C. Zulley and Louis Beasley, Esquires, of East St.Louis, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Gibson, It is ordered that Millward C. Taft, Esquire, of Chelsea, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. LeRoy L. Highs, It is ordered that A. George Bouchard, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Harris, It is ordered that Samuel Harber, Esquire, of Union City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George D. Horning, Jr., It is ordered that Isadore Levin, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis E. Spiegler, It is ordered that Hyman M. Seidelman, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis E. Spiegler, It is ordered that Morris Spector, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Otis Sprout,
Plaintiff in error,
208 vs.
City of South Bend, Indiana.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dudley M. Shively for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Iden S. Romig for the defendant in error.

Interstate Busses Corporation,
Appellant,
197 vs.
William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Edward H. Kelly for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Julia V. Miller, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
199 vs.
W. J. Schoene, State Entomologist.

This case was argued by Mr. Randolph Harrison for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. F. S. Tavener for the defendant in error.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner, etc.,
Petitioner,
201 vs.
George I. Rockwood.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations, etc.,
Petitioner,
202 vs.
George I. Rockwood.

These cases were argued by Mr. F. Delano Putnam for the petitioner, and by Mr. Merrill June for the respondent.

Joseph M. Davis & Southern Surety Co., Plaintiffs in error,
203 vs.
Esther M. Jessup, Adm'x., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Robert S. Neely for the plaintiffs in error, No brief filed for the defendant in error.

Montana National Bank of Billings,
Plaintiff in error,
207 vs.
Yellowstone County of the State of Montana et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Horace S. Davis for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. C. N. Davidson for the defendants in error.

State of Mississippi, for the use of Stokes V. Robertson,
Plaintiff in error,
206 vs.
W. J. Miller et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Stokes V. Robertson for the plaintiff in error, and the case submitted by Mr. Marion W. Reilly for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maxwell E. McDowell, It is ordered that James McKinley Rose, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that Samuel M. Samter, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, It is ordered that Samuel A. Syme, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan L. Strong, It is ordered that John S. Porter and Floy C. Jones, Esquires, of Kittanning, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that George P. Alt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland, It is ordered that Madge Lee Guard, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that Benjamin Y. Wolf, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that William A. Allen, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Harry Troll, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Finance and Guaranty Company,

Petitioner,

170 vs.

Henry W. Oppenhimer, Trustee in Bankruptcy for W. A. Lee, trading as National Motor Company, Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

In re Abraham S. Gilbert. }

[January 23, 1928.]

Mr. Chief Justice TAFT announced the opinion of the Court.

Under our order of November 21st, 1927, the clerk issued a rule to the respondent, Abraham S. Gilbert, of New York City, a member of this bar, which directed—

> That he make written report to this Court showing what fees or allowances have been paid to him (also when and by whom paid) for services as master in the several causes reviewed here during the October term, 1921, and reported in 259 U. S. 101, under the following titles: *Newton, as Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.*, v. *Consolidated Gas Company of New York*; *Same* v. *New York & Queens Gas Company*; *Same* v. *Central Union Gas Company*; *Same* v. *Northern Union Gas Company*; *Same* v. *New York Mutual Gas Light Company*; *Same* v. *Standard Gas Light Company of the City of New York*; *Same* v. *New Amsterdam Gas Company*; *Same* v. *East River Gas Company of Long Island City*.
>
> That he likewise report whether he has returned or repaid any portion of the fees or allowances received by him as such master, with dates and names of the parties.
>
> That if he has received fees or allowances as master in any of the specified causes exceeding the maximum amount held by us to be permissible, and has not returned or repaid the excess, then he shall show cause why his name ought not to be stricken from the roll of attorneys permitted to practice here and he be punished for contempt or otherwise dealt with as the circumstances may require.

On the return day, January 16, 1928, Gilbert presented himself, filed a written report, and was heard through counsel.

He asserts that he received as fees for services as master in the eight above-mentioned causes a total of $118,000; he sets out their several amounts and shows by whom and when they were paid. He avers that no one of the Gas Companies which paid these fees has ever questioned the amount or asked return of any portion, and says that he believes it was proper for him to retain them, notwithstanding they greatly exceeded what we declared permissible. But, he further says, that if this Court, after viewing his response, should conclude that he is under legal or moral obligation to return any part of them, he is willing so to do.

In December, 1921, the District Court for the Southern District of New York made allowances to respondent for services as master in each of the above-mentioned causes and directed that they be paid by the complaining corporations respectively and thereafter taxed as costs against the defendants, the Attorney General of New York and others. In obedience to such orders and before the time for appeal expired, these were paid, as follows: By Consolidated Gas Co., Dec. 13, 1921, $57,500.00; By N. Y. & Queens Gas Co., Dec. 16, 1921, $12,500.00; By Central Union Gas Co., Dec. 16, 1921, $12,500.00; By Northern Union Gas Co., Dec. 13, 1921, $7,500.00; By N. Y. Mutual Gas Light Co., Dec. 16, 1921, $11,500.00; By Standard Gas Light Co., Jan. 13, 1922, $7,500.00; By New Amsterdam Gas Co., Jan. 13, 1922, $4,500.00; By East River Gas Co., Jan. 13, 1922, $4,500.00.

The Attorney General and other defendants insisted that the allowances were excessive. The District Court overruled their objections; the matter came here and was decided May 15, 1922, 259 U. S. 101. We held that in the Consolidated Gas Company's case twice too much had been allowed and in the other causes three times too much—that the total compensation should not exceed $49,250. And further, that in making these awards the District Court abused its judicial discretion. Accordingly, we reversed the challenged decrees and remanded the causes with instructions to fix respondent's compensation within the following limitations: "In the cause wherein the Consolidated Gas Company is appellee here (No. 750) not exceeding $28,750—one-half of the amount heretofore allowed; in each of the other seven causes, Nos. 751, 752, 753, 832, 833, 844 and 845, not exceeding one-third of the amount heretofore allowed therein; and in the eight cases allowances totaling not more than $49,250." We also directed "such further action in conformity with this opinion as may be necessary."

Upon receipt of the mandates, issued here June 19, 1922, the District Court ordered that the master's fees to the extent of the maximum permitted by us should be taxed against the several defendants as costs. Respondent made no effort to secure any further orders or direction by the District Court or this Court.

More than a year thereafter—December, 1923—apparently moved by published criticisms, respondent instituted a proceeding against the Consolidated Gas Company in the Supreme Court of New York under Sec. 473, New York Civil Practice Act, wherein he sought and obtained a declaratory judgment reciting that that Company had no valid claim against him for return of any part of the $57,500 which it had paid. This proceeding was ill-advised, or worse, and the pronouncement therein cannot aid him here. The State Court had no power to determine the matter now before us.

Upon announcement of our opinion, May 15, 1922, it became the imperative duty of respondent immediately to return the fees received by him so far as they exceeded what we declared permissible. It is now his duty, without further delay, to return this excess with interest thereon at 6 per centum. from May 15, 1922.

When respondent accepted appointment as master he assumed the duties and obligations of a judicial officer. He could not rightfully accept or retain anything as compensation unless sanctioned by proper order of court. Reception then or now of a gratuity from any party would be indefensible, and whether or no the corporations which paid him by direction of the court are satisfied with the result is now unimportant. He has long been an attorney and counsellor authorized to practice at this bar under the sanction of an oath to demean himself "uprightly, and according to law." Notwithstanding the adjudication here that excessive fees had been allowed by orders granted in abuse of judicial discretion, he has retained them for more than five years. He knew that he had got unearned money by improper orders of court, but he decided to keep it. Such conduct is far from "upright and according to law" within the fair intendment of those terms.

Further action will be postponed until Monday, February 20th, 1928. The respondent will present himself at that time and report in writing concerning efforts made to comply with his obligations.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company Petitioner,
98 vs.
K. S. Leitch.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing herein, It is now here ordered that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument before the full Court on Monday, March 12th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Security Mortgage Company, Petitioner,
662 vs.
Charles A. Powers, Trustee in Bankruptcy for Florida Furniture Corporation, Bankrupt.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minnie H. Leach, Petitioner,
646 vs.
Floyd E. Fischer, Guardian of the Estates of Eleanor Ann Fischer and Roderick Leach Fischer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul Rubio,
Petitioner,
650 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Murphy,
Petitioner,
651 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Irving M. Austin,
Petitioner,
652 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Finance & Guaranty Company of
Baltimore, Md.,
Petitioner,
656 vs.
Harry C. Stitt, Trustee in Bankruptcy
of West York Motor Company, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Lawrence-Williams Company,
Petitioner,
658 vs.
Societe Enfants Gombault, et Cie.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Citizens & Southern Bank,
Petitioner,
661 vs.
Carrie Y. Fayram, as Executrix of
the Estate of Frederick Fayram.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry W. McMaster and Francis H. Skelding, as Receiver of the Wabash Pittsburgh Terminal Railway Company, Petitioners,
85 vs.
George J. Gould, Kingdon Gould, et al., as Executors, etc.

The return to the rule to show cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, in behalf of Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the respondents.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
2, Original.
The State of Texas.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Arthur Helen in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of The El Paso Commercial Company, Fred Freeman, Hemly & Rishaberger and Mrs. C. A. Kerber, as amici curiae, in support of complainant's petition for rehearing.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
2, Original.
The State of Texas.

On consideration of the motion for further extension of time for filing form of decree in this cause, it is now here ordred by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Addie Robinson, Administratrix of the Estate of Elbert R. Robinson, Petitioner.
No.——. vs.
American Car and Foundry Company.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Gray Lucas for the petitioner.

Steve Nechay, Petitioner,
642 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Black and Mr. Frank Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt and

P. DeRonde & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
654 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. W. W. Scott for the respondent.

National City Bank of Seattle,
Petitioner,
655 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

W. M. Farris, Shirley Smith, John B. Dunn, et al.,
Petitioners,
657 vs.
Illinois Bankers Life Association, W. H. Woods, J. R. Ebbersole, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeal for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse L. England for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. F. Potter and Mr. L. A. Stebbins for the respondents.

Herman Miller,
Petitioner,
665 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernhardt Frank for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The United States ex rel. Louis C. Mouquin, Petitioner,
669 vs.
William C. Hecht, as United States Marshal, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Joyce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Charles M. Baker, Petitioner,
672 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. S. Parsons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
674 vs.
De Forest Radio Telephone & Telegraph Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Wood, Mr. Drury W. Cooper, and Mr. Thomas Ewing for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Hughes, Mr. Thomas G. Haight, and Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr. for the respondent.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company and Edward H. Armstrong, Petitioners,
675 vs.
The United States of America, Alexander Meissner, General Electric Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Wood, Mr. Drury W. Cooper, and Mr. Thomas Ewing for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. Thomas G. Haight, Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., and Mr. William R. Ballard for the respondents.

Morris & Cummings Dredging Company, Inc., Petitioner,
681 vs.
Cahill Towing Line, Inc., as owner of the Steam tug "Anna W," and J. J. Hock, et al., as owners, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the respondents.

Floyd Richardson, Petitioner,
664 vs.
The State of California.

The motion for leave to withdraw the certified transcript of the record in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court on behalf of the clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of California.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 20 at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present: The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that Charles M. Thayer, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rolland L. Nutt, It is ordered that Leo T. Kissam, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York , be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Michael J. Doherty, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, and Charles C. Lark, Esquire, of Shamokin, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges, It is ordered that Eugene E. Kelly, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, It is ordered that William M. Seufert, Esquire, of Englewood, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Russell S. Ritz, It is ordered that John Kee, Esquire, of Bluefield, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Shelton, It is ordered that Forrest J. Hyde, Jr., Esquire, of Bronxville, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that C. M. Smithdeal, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that William A. Smith, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that John T. Smith, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles G. Edwards, It is ordered that Joseph H. Pottle, Esquire, of Milledgeville, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Beal, It is ordered that Edward Otis Proctor, Esquire, of Newton, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Frank Leveroni, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman L. Ekern, It is ordered that Luther Franklin Binkley, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Virgil M. Chapman, It is ordered that Harry D. Kremer, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that Tom J. Terrul, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dozier A. DeVane, It is ordered that Robert H. Strahan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer, It is ordered that C. Howland Chase, 3d, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl D. Loos, It is ordered that Preston B. Mavanagh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthew M. Neely, It is ordered that Clyde B. Johnson, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The People of Sioux County, Nebraska, Petitioner, 196 vs. National Surety Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Interstate Busses Corporation,

Petitioner,

197 vs.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut, Ernest E. Rogers, Treasurer of the State of Connecticut, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Western Union Telegraph Company,

Petitioner,

183 vs.

C. H. Priester.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the State of Alabama for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Western Union Telegraph Company, Petitioner, vs. C. H. Priester. 189

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Eleanor Saltonstall and Lawrence Brooks, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Leverett Saltonstall, et al., Trustees and Treasurer and Receiver General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. 144

In error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Julia V. Miller, Ada V. Miller and C. O. Miller, Plaintiffs in error, vs. W. J. Schoene, State Entomologist. 199

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heardon the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause,

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
119 vs.
Rosenberg Brothers & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California with instructions to dismiss the libel.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals should be affirmed.

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
120 vs.
California Wine Association.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California with instructions to dismiss the libel.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals should be affirmed.

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
121 vs.
S. L. Jones & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California with instructions to dismiss the libel.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals should be affirmed.

The Liberty National Bank of
Roanoke, Virginia,
Petitioner,
218 vs.
James A. Bear, Trustee in Bankruptcy
of W. L. Becker & Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Commercial Credit Company,
Petitioner,
258 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington with instructions to dismiss the libel.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Stone did not sit in this case.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Isadore N. Hellman.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Arnold J. Hellmich, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner, vs. Milton C. Hellman. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

300

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Magnolia Petroleum Company, E. H. Brown, H. Waverly Smith, et al., etc. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

283

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Hilbert Stuart Allan. 160

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

State of Mississippi for the use of Stokes V. Robertson, Plaintiff in error, vs. W. J. Miller and The American Surety Company. 206

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Courtof the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

T. Smith & Son, Inc.,

Plaintiff in error,

186 vs.

Fannie Robinson Taylor, Widow of George Taylor, individually and as representative of Her Minor Children, Essie and Lynn Taylor.

In error to the Court of Appeal, for the Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeal, for the Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeal, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

147 vs.

The Town of Morristown, Henry Laden, and others.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Concurring in part: Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Arthur C. Brown,

33 vs.

The United States of America.

On a certificate and transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Samuel J. Kornhauser,

Petitioner.

162 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Bountiful Brick Company and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Elizabeth W. Giles, as Widow and as Guardian, etc., and The Industrial Commission of Utah. 193

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Gulf Fisheries Company, Appellant, vs. John L. Darrouzet, District and County Attorney of Galveston County, Texas; D. B. MacInerney, Substituted by Agreement. 178

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Geo. O. Richardson Machinery Company, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Annie Scott, Administratrix of the Estate of John A. Scott, Deceased. 198

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

The Liberty Warehouse Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Appeals

18 vs. of the State of Kentucky.

Burley Tobacco Growers' Co-operative

Marketing Association.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds,

John C. Denney, as Director of Public

Works of Washington; O. O. Calderhead, as

Supervisor of Transportation of Appeal from the District Court of

Washington, and C. Rea Moore, etc., et al. the United States for the Western

Appellants, District of Washington.

150 vs.

The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph

Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds,

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

John C. Denney, as Director of Public Works of Washington; O. O. Calderhead, as Supervisor of Transportation of Washington; C. Rea Moore, etc., et al., Appellants,

151 vs.

Home Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds,

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Brimstone Railroad & Canal Company, Appellant,

240 vs.

The United States of America, Louisiana Western Railroad Company, Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds,.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

B. A. Marlin,
Petitioner,
vs.
John Lewallen and Lucy Condren.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

40

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

C. J. Longest,
Petitioner,
vs.
W. C. Langford and G. N. Puckett.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

52

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

James W. Wuchter,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Michael Pizzutti.

In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

142

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Katherine Linstead, Executrix of the Estate of John A. Linstead, Deceased, Petitioner, vs. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

171

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel V. Harkin and Union Bank of Chicago, Receivers, etc., Petitioners, vs. Edward J. Brundage, Receiver, etc., et al. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

117

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Addie Robinson, Administratrix of the Estate of Elbert R. Robinson,
Petitioner,
—, vs.
American Car and Foundry Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Floyd Richardson,
Petitioner,
664 vs.
The State of California.

B. Grant Taylor, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of California, having applied to this Court for permission to withdraw from the files of this Court certain documents filed on behalf of Floyd Richardson, as petitioner for the writ of certiorari, in the case of Floyd Richardson v. State of California, No. 664, October term, 1927, namely, document entitled "Petition for Hearing in the Supreme Court After Decision of the District Court of Appeals, Division Two, First Appellate District," and numbered Criminal 3039, and documents entitled "Clerk's Transcript on Appeal" and shorthand reporter's "Transcript on Appeal" in the District Court of Appeals, First Appellate District, State of California, and having represented that Floyd Richardson was at the time of the filing of his petition for certiorari, and still is, a prisoner in one of the State prisons of the State of California, and has represented himself without means to employ an attorney and to prepare copies of the documents necessary to be transmitted with his application for certiorari, and having applied to B. Grant Taylor, clerk of the Supreme Court of California, as clerk of the court, to copy, certify , and transmit the records as aforesaid, and it appearing that to avoid inconvenience and expense a copy of the petition for hearing in the Supreme Court of California was withdrawn from the clerk's office files in San Francisco in that court, and a copy of the transcript of judgment roll and of the testimony in the case was borrowed from the office of the attorney general of the State of California, and was transmitted to this Court, his application for the withdrawal is hereby granted, on condition that

the documents to be withdrawn from the files on this Court and returned to the clerk of the Supreme Court of California, shall remain on file in that court, so that should it become necessary they can be returned to this Court at any time for examination. The clerk of this Court is therefore directed to transmit to the clerk of the Supreme Court of California the above papers which constitute the certified transcript of record in the case of Floyd Richardson v. State of California, No. 664, October term, 1927, upon the files of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
723 vs.
Jacob A. Goldman, Louis J. Desmare,
Clem Miner, et al.

Gertrude Davis, &c
Plaintiff in error,
748 vs.
The State of Ohio.

M. J. Dugan,
Plaintiff in error,
766 vs.
The State of Ohio.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these criminal cases on the docket be, and they are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Fred M. Kirby,
Petitioner,
184 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Smith, Subiaco and Rock Island Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Emma Moore, Administratrix of the Estate of William Moore, deceased. 187

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph M. Davis and Southern Surety Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Esther M. Jessup, Administratrix of the Estate of Ursa S. Jessup, deceased. 203

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. De Forest Radio Telephone and Telegraph Company. 674

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company and Edward H. Armstrong,
Petitioners,
675 vs.
The United States of America, Alexander Meissner, General Electric Company, et al.

ORDER ALLOWING CERTIORARI.

The petition here in for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Steve Mechay,
Petitioner,
642 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. DeRonde & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
654 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National City Bank of Seattle,

Petitioner,

655 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. M. Farris, Shirley Smith, John B. Dunn, et al.,

Petitioners,

657 vs.

Illinois Bankers Life Association, W. H. Woods, J. R. Ebbersole, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman Miller,

Petitioner,

665 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States ex rel. Louis C. Mouquin, Petitioner, vs. William C. Hecht, as United States Marshal, etc.

669

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles M. Baker, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

672

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States CircuitCourt of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris & Cummings Dredging Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Cahill Towing Line, Inc., as owner of the Steam Tug "Anna W," and J. J. Hock, et al., as owners, etc.

681

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

Whereas there is now in the hands of the Clerk of this Court an accumulated fund of $7,403.49 which represents balances owing to litigants out of monies paid in to meet anticipated costs in cases which, although pending when the payments were made, were finally disposed of before the opening of the October Term, 1922, and

Whereas these monies have remained unclaimed up to the present time, and

Whereas the Clerk has made diligent but unsuccessful efforts to find the several claimants to the end that the monies might be paid over to them,

It is ordered: 1. The Clerk of this Court shall forthwith give public notice by publication once a week for three consecutive weeks in four daily newspapers of wide circulation, one of which shall be a newspaper published in the city of Washington, to the effect that all persons claiming to be entitled to any part of the monies hereinbefore described are required to present their claims on or before the 15th day of May, 1928, and that all of such monies to which no valid claim is presented before that date will be disposed of as hereinafter provided:

2. All of such monies to which no valid claim is presented within the time so prescribed shall be paid by the Clerk into the Treasury of the United States, to be there held and disposed of as is now or may be hereafter provided by law.

3. This order shall not relieve any litigant against whom costs were adjudged from the obligation to pay the same where that obligation has not been performed; nor shall it affect the right of a litigant in whose favor they were adjudged to receive them when paid.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

It is hereby ordered that the opinion in Cause No. 154 of the present term, John W. Blodgett v. Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue, on certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, heretofore handed down, be modified and made to read in the following manner:

By the Court: An equal division of opinion among the eight Justices who heard and considered this matter renders it impossible categorically to answer certified question No. 2. The other two questions we think are not essential. The statements of views by the Justices are enough to show that the tax exacted of Blodgett can not be sustained under Sections 319-324 of the Revenue Act of 1924, and they will enable the Circuit Court of Appeals readily to reach a proper decision. The cause will be remanded there for appropriate action.

Mr. Justice McReynolds--

(Insert here his views as they appear in the opinion heretofore handed down, but strike out the words--"And the question is so answered.")

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Van Devanter, and Mr. Justice Butler concur in this opinion,

Mr. Justice Holmes--

(Insert here his views as they appear in the opinion heretofore handed down.)

Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Sanford, and Mr. Justice Stone concur in this opinion.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 154.—October Term, 1927.

John W. Blodgett, vs. Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue. } On Certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It is hereby ordered that the opinion in Cause No. 154 of the present term, *John W. Blodgett* v. *Charles Holden, Collector of Internal Revenue*, on certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, heretofore handed down be modified and made to read in the following manner:

By the Court: An equal division of opinion among the eight Justices who heard and considered this matter renders it impossible categorically to answer certified question No. 2. The other two questions we think are not essential. The statements of views by the Justices are enough to show that the tax exacted of Blodgett can not be sustained under Sections 319-324 of the Revenue Act of 1924, and they will enable the Circuit Court of Appeals readily to reach a proper decision. The cause will be remanded there for appropriate action.

February 20, 1928.

[November 21, 1927.]

Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit has certified three questions and asked instructions in respect of them. Title 28, Section 346, U. S. C. It is only necessary to answer the one which follows.

Are the provisions of Sec. 319-324 of the Revenue Act of 1924, c. 234, 43 Stat. 313, unconstitutional insofar as they impose and levy a tax upon transfers of property by gifts *inter vivos*, not made in contemplation of death, and made prior to June 2, 1924, on which date the Act was approved.

O R D E R

Whereas there is now in the hands of the Clerk of this Court an accumulated fund of $7,403.49 which represents balances owing to litigants out of monies paid in to meet anticipated costs in cases which, although pending when the payments were made, were finally disposed of before the opening of the October Term, 1922, and

Whereas these monies have remained unclaimed up to the present time, and

Whereas the Clerk has made diligent but unsuccessful efforts to find the several claimants to the end that the monies might be paid over to them,

It is ordered: 1. The Clerk of this Court shall forthwith give public notice by publication once a week for three consecutive weeks in four daily newspapers of wide circulation, one of which shall be a newspaper published in the city of Washington, to the effect that all persons claiming to be entitled to any part of the monies hereinbefore described are required to present their claims on or before the 15th day of May, 1928, and that all of such monies to which no valid claim is presented before that date will be disposed of as hereinafter provided:

2. All of such monies to which no valid claim is presented within the time so prescribed shall be paid by the Clerk into the Treasury of the United States, to be there held and disposed of as is now or may be hereafter provided by law.

3. This order shall not relieve any litigant against whom costs were adjudged from the obligation to pay the same where that obligation has not been performed; nor shall it affect the right of a litigant in whose favor they were adjudged to receive them when paid.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

because the same is a direct tax and unapportioned, or because it takes property without due process, or for public use without just compensation, in violation of the Fifth Amendment?

The Revenue Act approved June 2, 1924, provides—

Sec. 319. For the calendar year 1924 and each calendar year thereafter, a tax equal to the sum of the following is hereby imposed upon the transfer by a resident by gift during such calendar year of any property wherever situated, whether made directly or indirectly, and upon the transfer by a nonresident by gift during such calendar year of any property situated within the United States, whether made directly or indirectly: 1 per centum of the amount of the taxable gifts not in excess of $50,000, etc. . . .

Sec. 320. If the gift is made in property, the fair market value thereof at the date of the gift shall be considered the amount of the gift. Where property is sold or exchanged for less than a fair consideration in money or money's worth, then the amount by which the fair market value of the property exceeded the consideration received shall, for the purpose of the tax imposed by section 319, be deemed a gift, and shall be included in computing the amount of gifts made during the calendar year.

Section 321 allows certain deductions—

[$50,000; donations for charitable purposes, etc.]

Section 322 is unimportant here.

Section 323. Any person who within the year 1924 or any calendar year thereafter makes any gift or gifts in excess of the deductions allowed by section 321 shall, on or before the 15th day of March, file with the collector a return under oath in duplicate, listing and setting forth therein all gifts and contributions made by him during such calendar year. . . .

Sec. 324. The tax imposed by section 319 shall be paid by the donor on or before the 15th day of March, and shall be assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner and subject, in so far as applicable, to the same provisions of law as the tax imposed by section 301.

Act of February 26, 1926, 44 Stat. 86, c. 27—

Sec. 324. (a) Section 319 of the Revenue Act of 1924 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 319. For the calendar year 1924 and the calendar year 1925, a tax equal to the sum of the following is hereby imposed upon the transfer by a resident by gift during such calendar year of any property wherever situated, whether made directly or indirectly, and upon the transfer by a nonresident by gift during such calendar year of any property situated within the United States, whether made directly or indirectly: 1 per centum of the amount of the gifts not in excess of $50,000; . . ." [Some of the succeeding percentages are less and some are higher than those specified by the Act of 1924.]

(b) Subdivision (a) of this section shall take effect as of June 2, 1924.

During the calendar year 1924, and prior to June 2 plaintiff Blodgett, a resident of the United States, transferred by gifts *inter vivos*, and not in contemplation of death, property valued at more than $850,000.00; after June 2 he made other gifts valued at $6,500.00. The collector exacted of him the tax prescribed by the Act of 1924, as amended, on such transfers and this suit seeks recovery of the sum so paid. The claim is that the Taxing Act, if applicable in the circumstances stated, conflicts with the Fifth Amendment.

At the argument here counsel for Blodgett affirmed that all the transfers prior to June 2 were really made during the month of January; and the accuracy of this statement was not questioned. Under the circumstances, we will treat this affirmation as if it were part of the recital of facts by the court below.

The brief in behalf of the Collector sets out the legislative history of the gift tax provisions in the Revenue Act of 1924 and shows that they were not presented for the consideration of Congress prior to February 25 of that year. We must, therefore, determine whether Congress had power to impose a charge upon the donor because of gifts fully consummated before such provisions came before it.

In *Nichols* v. *Coolidge* (May 31, 1926) this Court pointed out that a statute purporting to lay a tax may be so arbitrary and capricious that its enforcement would amount to deprivation of property without due process of law within the inhibition of the Fifth Amendment. As to the gifts which Blodgett made during January, 1924, we think the challenged enactment is arbitrary and for that reason invalid. It seems wholly unreasonable that one

MILBY PRINTING CO., 1928 - CONTINUED.

O R D E R

Whereas there is now in the hands of the Clerk of this Court an accumulated fund of $7,403.49 which represents balances owing to litigants out of monies paid in to meet anticipated costs in cases which, although pending when the payments were made, were finally disposed of before the opening of the October Term, 1922, and

Whereas these monies have remained unclaimed up to the present time, and

Whereas the Clerk has made diligent but unsuccessful efforts to find the several claimants to the end that the monies might be paid over to them,

It is ordered: 1. The Clerk of this Court shall forthwith give public notice by publication once a week for three consecutive weeks in four daily newspapers of wide circulation, one of which shall be a newspaper published in the city of Washington, to the effect that all persons claiming to be entitled to any part of the monies hereinbefore described are required to present their claims on or before the 15th day of May, 1928, and that all of such monies to which no valid claim is presented before that date will be disposed of as hereinafter provided:

2. All of such monies to which no valid claim is presented within the time so prescribed shall be paid by the Clerk into the Treasury of the United States, to be there held and disposed of as is now or may be hereafter provided by law.

3. This order shall not relieve any litigant against whom costs were adjudged from the obligation to pay the same where that obligation has not been performed; nor shall it affect the right of a litigant in whose favor they were adjudged to receive them when paid.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

who, in entire good faith and without the slightest premonition of such consequence, made absolute disposition of his property by gifts should thereafter be required to pay a charge for so doing.

Determination of the cause does not require us to consider other objections to the Statute which have been advanced. And it is unnecessary to express an opinion concerning the validity of the Statute as to transfers subsequent to June 2. Here, all such gifts were within the exemption granted.

So far as the Revenue Act of 1924 undertakes to impose a tax because of the gifts made during January, 1924, it is arbitrary and invalid under the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment.

The CHIEF JUSTICE, Mr. Justice VAN DEVANTER, and Mr. Justice BUTLER concur in this opinion.

Mr. Justice HOLMES.

Although research has shown and practice has established the futility of the charge that it was a usurpation when this Court undertook to declare an Act of Congress unconstitutional, I suppose that we all agree that to do so is the gravest and most delicate duty that this Court is called on to perform. Upon this among other considerations the rule is settled that as between two possible interpretations of a statute, by one of which it would be unconstitutional and by the other valid, our plain duty is to adopt that which will save the Act. Even to avoid a serious doubt the rule is the same. *United States* v. *Delaware & Hudson Co.*, 213 U. S. 366, 407, 408. *United States* v. *Standard Brewery*, 251 U. S. 210, 220. *Texas* v. *Eastern Texas R. R. Co.*, 258 U. S. 204, 217. *Bratton* v. *Chandler*, 260 U. S. 110, 114. *Panama R. R. Co.* v. *Johnson*, 264 U. S. 375, 390. Words have been strained more than they need to be strained here in order to avoid that doubt. *United States* v. *Jim Fuey Moy*, 241 U. S. 394, 401, 402. In a different sphere but embodying the same general attitude as to construction, see *United States* v. *Goelet*, 232 U. S. 293, 297.

By § 319 of the Revenue Act of 1924, (June 2, 1924, c. 234; 43 Stat. 253, 313) a tax is laid on gifts 'For the calendar year 1924 and each calendar year thereafter' In the Code the words are 'during any calendar year', Title 26 § 1131. The latter phrase

brings out what I should think was obvious without its aid, that the purpose is a general one to indicate the periods to be regarded, as distinguished from fiscal years, not necessarily to run counter to the usual understanding that statutes direct themselves to future not to past transactions. *Reynolds* v. *McArthur*, 2 Pet. 417, 434. *Shwab* v. *Doyle*, 258 U. S. 529, 534. *Lewellyn* v. *Frick*, 268 U. S. 238, 251, 252. If when the statute was passed it had been well recognized that Congress had no power to tax past gifts I think that we should have no trouble in reading the Act as meant to operate only from its date and only to tax gifts thereafter made. If I am right, we should read it in that way now. By § 324(a) of the Revenue Act of 1926, (February 26, 1926, c. 27; 44 Stat. 9, 86,) § 319 of the Act of 1924 is amended and the rates of taxation are reduced, and then by (b) it is provided that 'subdivision (a) of this section shall take effect as of June 2, 1924', the date when the earlier act was passed. A reasonable interpretation is that the reduction and the tax operate alike on gifts after that date. Taking both statutes into account, and the principles of construction to which I have referred, I think it tolerably plain that the Act should be read as referring only to transactions taking place after it was passed, when to disregard the rule 'would be to impose an unexpected liability that if known might have induced those concerned to avoid it and to use their money in other ways.' *Lewellyn* v. *Frick*, 268 U. S. 232, 251, 252.

On the general question whether there is power to tax gifts I express no opinion now. I agree with the result that the plaintiff is entitled to recover the taxes paid in respect of gifts made before the statute went into effect.

Mr. Justice BRANDEIS, Mr. Justice SANFORD and Mr. Justice STONE concur in this opinion.

A true copy.

Test:

Clerk, Supreme Court, U. S.

O R D E R

On the application of the Clerk, pursuant to Section 221 of the Judicial Code, It is ordered that Horatio Stonier be, and he is hereby, appointed a Deputy Clerk of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 6, Original. vs. The State of Texas, et al.

The return to the rule to show cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the United States.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 6, Original. vs. The State of Texas, et al.

The return to the rule to show cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in behalf of Mr. Claude Pollard for the State of Texas.

United States of America, Complainant, 13, Original. vs. State of Idaho.

The motion for judgment on the pleadings and proposed form of decree was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the complainant.

The Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians, Appellants, 596 vs. The United States.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Thomas Sterling and Mr. Robert T. Tedrow for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Charley Hee, Alias Dong Bow Hee, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 446

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts in this cause and the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be reversed, and the cause remanded to the said District Court with directions to grant the petitioner a new trial;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and the decree of the said District Court of the United States in this cause be, and the same are hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts with directions to grant the petitioner a new trial.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Goon Bon June, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 448

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be reversed, and the decree of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts in this cause affirmed, and the cause remanded to the said District Court with direction to discharge the petitioner from custody;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, and the decree of the said District Court affirmed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts with direction to discharge the petitioner from custody.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sidney T. Ewert, Executor, James J. Mabon, Lenois C. Church, et al., etc., et al., Petitioners,
677 vs.
Georgia Valliere Hampton, James Amos Valliere, Iva Amelia Valliere Wilson, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file an amended petition for writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Frost, doing business under the firm name of Mitchell Gin Company, Appellant,
740 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, Fred Capshaw et al.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard D. Wilmer in that behalf.

Roy Olmstead, Jerry L. Finch, et al., Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.
Charles S. Green, Emory A. Kern, et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
The United States of America.
Edward H. McInnis, Petitioner,
533 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Robert H. Strahan, leave was granted to file a brief of The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, American Telephone and Telegraph Company, United States Independent Telephone Association, and Tri-State Telephone and Telegraph Company, as amici curiae, in these cases.

Foster-Fountain Packing Company, Inc., and Sea Food Company, Appellants,
768 vs.
E. J. Haydel, Fred Schouest, L. R. Cabriac, et al.
L. O. Johnson, Jr., and Sea Food Company, Tanas Hebert, et al., Appellants,
769 vs.
E. J. Haydel, Fred Schouest, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Percy Saint, Mr. Peyton R. Sandoz, Mr. M. M. Irwin, and Mr. John Dymond for the appellees.

The Williamsport Wire Rope Company, Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

The motion to reversed and remand this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence A. Miller for the petitioner, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent, in opposition thereto.

L. F. Vance, Appellant,
631 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company, Edwin L. Belshe, et al.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Evans for the respondents in support of the motion.

J. W. Hampton, Jr. & Co., Petitioner,
242 vs.
The United States.

The motion for leave to file a brief of Charles F. Kingsley, as amicus curiae in this case, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Kingsley in that behalf, and the motion was denied.

Ex parte: In the matter of
Abraham S. Gilbert.

The petitioner presented himself at the bar of this Court, and submitted in person his return to the rule.

L. F. Vance,
Appellant,
631 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company, Edwin L. Belshe, et al.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se, in support of the motion, and by Mr. John T. Evans for the appellees in opposition thereto.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

The motion to transfer the fund held in trust by the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to the custody of the Clerk of this Court was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

The motion for leave to file petition for a rehearing out of time under rule 30 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se.

Ed. W. Hopkins, Assessor of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, et al.,
Petitioners,
133 vs.
Southern California Telephone Company and The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Preston B. Kavanaugh in that behalf, leave was granted to file a petition for a rehearing out of time under rule 30, in this case.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
15 Original. vs.
The State of Kansas and The Finney County Water Users' Association.

The motion for leave to file a motion to dismiss and brief in support thereof by March 24th next, and to set the case for argument on such motion, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendants.

Byron Dunn and W. Robert Dunn,
Petitioners,
721 vs.
J. Horace Lyons, Sheriff.

The motion by W. Robert Dunn, one of the petitioners, for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, which motion suggests the death of Byron Dunn, the copetitioner in this case, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. G. Adams and Mr. C. W. Howth for the petitioner.

Byron Dunn and W. Robert Dunn,
Petitioners,
721 vs.
J. Horace Lyons, Sheriff.

The motion by W. Robert Dunn for an order directing that the record shall be printed at public expense, and for a refund of the deposit heretofore made, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. G. Adams and Mr. C. W. Howth for the petitioner.

Botany Worsted Mills,
Petitioner,
659 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan A. Smyth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner,
667 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Carter Pope for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Lisle A. Smith for the respondent.

John Morini, Petitioner,
668 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Mossholder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Alfred H. Beach, Petitioner,
670 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frans E. Lindquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Page Steel & Wire Company, Petitioner,
671 vs.
Blair Engineering Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Gifford, Mr. Wilson B. Brice, and Mr. Forrest M. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Merritt Lane for the respondent.

Sidney T. Ewert, Executor, James S. Mabon, et al., etc., et al., Petitioners,
677 vs.
Georgia Valliere Hampton, James Amos Valliere, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Stone, Mr. A. C. Wallace, and Mr. Wm. M. Matthews for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph W. Howell for the respondents.

Richard Crane, Petitioner,
678 vs.
Commonwealth of Virginia and County of Charles City.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. W. Patterson for the petitioner.

Farmers Union Grain Company, Petitioner,
680 vs.
Hallet & Carey Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Junell and Mr. Egbert S. Oakley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick H. Stinchfield for the respondent.

Rocco DeBellis, Petitioner,
682 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert A. Milroy and Mr. Benjamin P. Epstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Farmers State Bank of Rosalie, Nebraska, and Guarantee Fund Commission of Nebraska,
Petitioners,
683 vs.
Metropolitan Savings Bank & Trust Company of Pittsburgh.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Skiles and Mr. Ernest B. Perry for the petitioners.

Remington Arms Union Metallic Cartridge Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Dwight E. Rorer for the respondent.

Northern Coal & Dock Company and General Accident, Fire & Life Assurance Corporation, Ltd., etc.,
Petitioners,
685 vs.
Emma Strand and Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Quarles, Mr. Lyman T. Powell, and Mr. John S. Sprowls for the petitioners, and by Mr. John A. Cadigan for the respondent.

Eagle Indemnity Company,
Petitioner,
688 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Rixey and Mr. Cleaton E. Rabey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
689 vs.
Edward Bilyeu.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, Fourth District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Eggers, Mr. Edward C. Kramer, Mr. Rudolph J. Kramer, Mr. Bruce A. Campbell, and Mr. Morison R. Waite for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Beasley and Mr. Edward C. Zulley for the respondent.

Fred S. Hudson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Interstate Refineries, Inc., and James B. Mourse, Trustee, etc., Petitioners,
690 vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry A. Bundschu for the petitioners, and by Mr. Spencer Harris and Mr. Clyde Taylor for the respondent.

Austin Morley, Eugene H. McCarthy, et al., Petitioners,
691 vs.
Herbert A. Wilson, Police Commissioner of the City of Boston.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, County of Suffolk, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Romney Spring and Mr. Wm. G. Thompson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Herbert Parker for the respondent.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company and Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Company, Petitioners,
692 vs.
Roy Hooper, Tax Collector of Sevier County, Arkansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Moore, Mr. A. F. Smith, Mr. James B. McDonough, and Mr. Samuel W. Moore, for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. C. Lake for the respondent.

The Buckey Incubator Company and Samuel B. Smith, Petitioners,
693 vs.
Ira M. Petersime and Ray Petersime.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Brock, Mr. Newton D. Baker, and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. A. Toulmin and Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., for the respondents.

Carolina A. Allison, John Allison, et al., Petitioners,
694 vs.
Harry J. Schnell and Frank V. Baldwin, executors, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman, and Mr. George D. Horning, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Josiah Stryker and Mr. Edw. L. Katzenbach for the respondents.

Virginia Shipbuilding Corporation and Joseph L. Crupper, Receiver, etc., Petitioners,
695 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. A. Barber, Mr. Wm. L. Day, Mr. J. K. M. Norton, and Mr. James R. Caton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmum, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, and Mr. W. W. Nottingham for the respondent.

Morris & Company, Petitioner,
698 vs.
K. Ikuno, Master and Claimant of the Steamship "Naples Maru."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Lanning, and Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr. for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Sprague for the respondent.

Greater New York Dock & Warehouse Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
Stapleton Dock & Warehouse Corporation and The City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Silbiger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert S. Boardman and Mr. George P. Nicholson for the respondents.

Knickerbocker Fuel Company,
Petitioner,
703 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Poore for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the respondent.

State of Washington on the relation of Crooker Perry and Leonora Perry, his wife, Petitioners,
704 vs.
The Superior Court of the State of Washington for the County of Chelan et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Reeves for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. G. Dorety, Mr. Thomas Balmer, Mr. Frank T. Post and Mr. Charles S. Albert for the respondents.

The United States,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
Robert H. Lenson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. George A. King, Mr. William B. King, and Mr. George R. Shields for the respondent.

Marion & Eastern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
706 vs.
Illinois Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Keene for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. V. Fletcher and Mr. Edward C. Craig for the respondent.

Pacific Steamship Company, Petitioner,
707 vs.
Carl G. Peterson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin S. Grosscup, Mr. W. Carr Morrow, and Mr. J. O. Davies for the petitioner.

Lillian Weare, Petitioner,
709 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald Grant Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

W. S. McCray, Petitioner,
710 vs.
J. A. Fulp, Receiver for the Sapulpa Petroleum Company and Sapulpa Petroleum Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Finis E. Riddle for the petitioner.

Martine Gimal,
Petitioner,
711 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Reid for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

John Quinlan, W. W. Brown, Will Stuckey, et al.,
Petitioners,
713 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Akerman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Abraham Buckspan,
Petitioner,
714 vs.
The Hudson's Bay Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George O. Wallace and Mr. W. L. Crawford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert E. L. Saner for the respondent.

John W. Gleason, doing business as John W. Gleason Cotton Company,
Petitioner,
715 vs.
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Brennan for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Ormonde Hunter for the respondent.

Duluth & Iron Range Railroad Company, Petitioner,
724 vs.
The City of Duluth.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank D. Adams and Mr. Elmer F. Blu for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Richards for the respondent.

Josiah T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia, Petitioner,
726 vs.
Munnally Investment Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mrs. K. L. Campbell, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. L. H. Baylies for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clifford L. Anderson and Mr. Daniel W. Rountree for the respondent.

Ella R. Clarke, Plaintiff in error,
96 vs.
Shoshoni Lumber Company and Allan Boysen.

The motion to dismiss was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of counsel for the respondent.

Roy Olmstead, Jerry L. Finch, et al., Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.
Charles S. Green, Emory A. Kern, et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
The United States of America.
Edward H. McInnis, Petitioner,
533 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. LeRoy L. Hight, It is ordered that Shelby S. Faulkner, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. LeRoy L. Hight, It is ordered that Clark T. Brown, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carland S. Ferguson, Jr., It is ordered that Chas. A. Hines, Esquire, of Greensboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph J. Kelley, It is ordered that Leon E. Cone, Esquire, of Morristown, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph J. Kelley, It is ordered that Samuel Dreskin, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Alexander, It is ordered that Clarence L. O'Donnell, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. H. De Lacy, It is ordered that James John Hayden, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. LeRoy L. Hight, It is ordered that Thomas M. Mather, Esquire, of Watertown, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thos. J. Walsh, It is ordered that John F. Nugent, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that William Fraser Himes, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy C. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Stewart L. Tatum, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. C. Rigby, It is ordered that John A. Hull, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

O R D E R

To-morrow, February 22, being a legal holiday, there will be no session of the Court. The Court will adjourn at the conclusion of to-day's business until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fannie E. Untermyer, as Executrix etc., Petitioner,
221 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Jr., leave was granted to file a brief of Ira Jewell Williams, as amicus curiae in this case.

Roy Olmstead, Jerry L. Finch, et al., Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.
Charles S. Green, Emory A. Kern, et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
The United States of America.
Edward H. McInnis, Petitioner,
533 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Frank R. Jeffrey for the petitioners, and concluded by Mr. Michael J. Doherty for the respondent.

State of Ohio, on relation of
National Mutual Insurance Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
430 vs.
William C. Safford, Superintendent of
Insurance, etc.
State of Ohio, on relation of the
Celina Mutual Casualty Company,
Plaintiff in error,
431 vs.
William C. Safford, Superintendent of
Insurance, etc.

These cases were argued by Mr. Arthur I. Vorys and Mr. Herman L. Ekern for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. C. S. Younger for the defendant in error.

Ella R. Clarke,
Plaintiff in error,
96 vs.
Shoshoni Lumber Company and Allan
Boysen.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell, of counsel for defendants in error in this cause, and he having filed a motion to dismiss, and having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. E. Byram, Mark W. Potter, and
Edward J. Brundage, as Receivers,
etc., Appellants,
501 vs.
A. G. Risty, Chris Olson, L. E.
Larson, et al., etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. H. E. Judge, to substitute the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company as the party appellant in this cause in the place of H. E. Byram, Mark W. Potter and Edward J. Brundage, as Receivers, etc., pursuant to a stipulation of counsel filed herein;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1928 - CONTINUED.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant;

501 vs.

A. C. Risty et al., etc., et al.

Argument commenced by Mr. H. E. Judge for the appellant, and continued by Mr. T. M. Bailey for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Thursday next, at 12 O'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. J. Driver, It is ordered that Myron Treavor Mailling, Esquire, of Gulfport, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Brandt, It is ordered that Moses Ehrenworth, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Archibald Palmer, It is ordered that Hugo Levy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. O'Brien, It is ordered that Henry S. Drezner, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, It is ordered that Malcolm K. Whyte, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur R. Robinson, It is ordered that Albert Ward, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Lucy B. Brooke,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
City of Norfolk et al.

This case was passed on motion of Mr. Andrew J. Montague in behalf of counsel for the respondents.

Albert S. Williams, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Tennessee, L. D. Smith, Attorney General of Tennessee, et al., Appellants,
763 vs.
The Standard Oil Company of Louisiana.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Charles T. Cates, Jr., the time within which to file statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed in this case was extended to and including March 10th, per stipulation of counsel.

Albert S. Williams, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Tennessee, L. D. Smith, Attorney General of Tennessee, et al., Appellants,
764 vs.
The Texas Company.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Charles T. Cates, Jr., the time within which to file statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed in this case was extended to and including March 10th, per

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant, 501 vs. A. G. Risty, et al., etc., et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. T. M. Bailey for the appellant, by Mr. N. B. Bartlett and Mr. E. O. Jones for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. H. E. Judge for the appellant.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 204 vs. Amalia Manzi.	This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner. No brief was filed for the respondent.
National Leather Company, Plaintiff in error, 205 vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.	This case was argued by Mr. Philip Nichols for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James S. Eastham for the defendant in error.
V. L. Highland, Petitioner, 209 vs. Russell Car & Snow Plow Co.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry M. Low, It is ordered that Marshall Low, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that A. G. Divet, Esquire, of Fargo, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson A. Mason, It is ordered that William D. Campbell, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Bernard J. Cnen, Esquire, of Battle Creek, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace L. Lohnes, It is ordered that Charles A. Ellis, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motinn first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. J. Montague, It is ordered that Leon M. Bazile, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Will A. Blanchard, Esquire, of Anoka, State of Minnesota, and Henry A. Larson, Esquire, of Preston, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

John Lapique, an assignee of the estate of Miguel Leonis, deceased, Appellant,

vs.

Harry L. Dunnigan, E. R. Plummer, Frank E. Walsh, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

233

This cause having been called for hearing on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and no counsel appearing for either party.

Therefore, in pursuance of the twenty-first rule of this Court, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

V. L. Highland,
Petitioner,
209 vs.
Russell Car & Snow Plow Co.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. A. M. Liveright for the respondent.

Harry Levy, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
217 vs.
Industrial Finance Corporation, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. S. M. Brandt for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Fannie E. Untermyer, as executrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
221 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that George C. Faulkner, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Perry, It is ordered that Hartley Sanders, Esquire, of Princeton, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Morganston, It is ordered that Warner I. Cubberly, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that Blair S. Shuman, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. McLean, It is ordered that Benedict M. Holden, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Robert A. B. Cook, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Paul G. Eger, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Robert H. Brenner, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Maurice V. Semple, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Clifford E. Smith, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that James L. Byrd, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter E. Barton, It is ordered that Harry F. Kantner, Esquire, of Reading, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that John Davey, Esquire, of Tecumseh, State of Nebraska, and Ray W. Nedrow, Esquire, of Fairmont, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam G. Bratton, It is ordered that Edwin Mechem, Esquire, of Las Cruces, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that A. T. Higgins and Max M. Schaumburger, Esquires, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theo. E. Burton, It is ordered that T. G. Thompson, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings, It is ordered that V. P. Crowe, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Blair, It is ordered that John G. Kaufman, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The United States of America, Complainant,
13 Original. vs.
The State of Idaho.

On consideration of the motion of the United States for judgment on the pleadings herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the decree as proposed by the United States be entered, and that the Clerk be directed to send a copy thereof to the Governor of the State of Idaho, and to the Secretary of the Interior.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado, Complainant,
15 Original.
The State of Kansas, et al.

On consideration of the motion by the defendant for leave to file a motion to dismiss the bill of complaint in equity and to dismiss the cause herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with the provision that the defendant shall serve upon counsel for the complainant a brief in support thereof on or before March 3, 1928. And the motion to set the cause down for oral argument on such motion to dismiss is granted and the cause is set for hearing on the first Monday in October next, after the causes heretofore set for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians, Appellants,
596 vs.
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Frost, doing business under the Firm Name of Mitchell Gin Company, Appellant,
740 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, Fred Capshaw, Frank Carter, et al., etc., et al.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Foster-Fountain Packing Company, Inc., and Sea Food Company, Appellants,
768 vs.
E. J. Haydel, Fred Schouest, L. R. Cabriac, et al.
L. O. Johnson, Jr. and Sea Food Company, Tanas Hebert, et al., Appellants,
769 vs.
E. J. Haydel, Free Schouest, L. R. Cabriac, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, April 16th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. F. Vance, Appellant,
631 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company, Edwin L. Belshe, Waymond T. Wright, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. John T. Evans, counsel for the appellees in this cause, and he having filed a motion to dismiss, and having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal in this cause:

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff.

13 Original vs.

The State of Idaho,

Defendant.

D E C R E E

This cause came before this Court on motion of the United States for judgment on the pleadings and, after consideration of the bill of complaint and the answer, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed:

That Clear Lists #3, #10, #23, and #29, approved by the Secretary of the Interior on October 12, 1917, December 19, 1917, June 19, 1920, and January 14, 1922, respectively, running to the State of Idaho from the United States, be reformed by eliminating therefrom all reference to the following described lands, to wit:

From Clear List #3, all of section twenty (Sec. 20); the northwest quarter (NW.¼), the north half of the southwest quarter (N.½ SW.¼), and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter (NW.¼ SE. ¼) of section twenty-eight (Sec. 28), in township fifty-eight north (T. 58 N.) of range three west (R. 3 W.), Boise Meridian;

From Clear List #10, the south half of the south half of section eighteen (S. ½ S. ½ Sec. 18), in township fifty-eight north (T. 58 N.) of range three west (R. 3 W.), Boise Meridian;

From Clear List #23 the south half of the southwest quarter (S. ½ SW. ¼) and the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter (SW. ¼ SE. ¼) of section seventeen (Sec. 17), and the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter (NW. ¼ SW. ¼), and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter (SE ¼ SW ¼) of section twenty-one (Sec. 21), in township fifty-eight north (T. 58 N.) of range three west (R. 3 W.), Boise Meridian;

From Clear List #29, lot two of section twenty-seven (Lot 2, Sec. 27); lot one of section thirty-three (Lot 1, Sec. 33); lots four and six (Lots 4 and 6) and the east half of the southwest quarter (E ½ SW. ¼) of section thirty-four (Sec. 34); all within township fifty-eight north (T. 58 N.) of range four west (R. 4 W), Boise Meridian;

That the title to and ownership of said lands are in the United States of America and that the defendant, the State of Idaho, has no state, right, title or interest therein; that the cloud cast upon the title of said lands by reason of the inclusion of said lands in the Clear Lists aforesaid be and

is hereby dissolved and removed; and the State of Idaho is hereby decreed and adjudged to have the right to select under the laws of the United States in satisfaction of its school land grants, lands equivalent to those so eliminated from said Clear Lists, and that no costs be awarded to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. F. Vance,
Appellant,
631 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company, Edwin L. Belshe, Waymond T. Wright, et al.

On consideration of the suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein out of time under rule 30, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

On consideration of the motion of the petitioner in this cause to transfer a fund held by the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois to the custody of the Clerk of this Court,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Byron Dunn and W. Robert Dunn,
Petitioners,
721 vs.
J. Horace Lyons, Sheriff.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the motion of the petitioner in this cause for a refund of the deposit heretofore made in the cause, be, and the same is hereby, denied. Such additional costs as may have already been incurred herein and not paid shall, by direction of the Court, be paid by the

Byron Dunn and W. Robert Dunn, Petitioners, vs. J. Horace Lyons, Sheriff. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

721

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Ohio, on relation of National Mutual Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. William C. Safford, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

430

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Ohio, on relation of the Celina Mutual Casualty Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. William C. Safford, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Ohio. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

431

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Botany Worsted Mills,
Petitioner,
659 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard Crane,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Commonwealth of Virginia and County of Charles City.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Remington Arms Union Metallic Cartridge Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Coal & Dock Company and General Accident, Fire & Life Assurance Corporation, Ltd. of Perth, Scotland, Petitioners,
685 vs.
Emma Strand and Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company and Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company, Petitioners,
692 vs.
Roy Hooper, Tax Collector of Sevier County, Arkansas.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company, Petitioner,
667 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Morini,
Petitioner,
668 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alfred H. Beach,
Petitioner,
670 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Page Steel & Wire Company,
Petitioner,
671 vs.
Blair Engineering Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sidney T. Ewert, Executor, James S. Mabon, et al., etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Georgia Valliere Hampton, James Amos Valliere, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

677

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Farmers Union Grain Company, Petitioner, vs. Hallet & Carey Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

680

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Farmers State Bank of Rosalie, Nebraska and Guarantee Fund Commission of Nebraska, Petitioners, vs. Metropolitan Savings Bank & Trust Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

683

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eagle Indemnity Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

688

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Edward Bilyeu. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court, Fourth District, of the State of Illinois.

689

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court, Fourth District of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred S. Hudson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Interstate Refineries, Inc., and James B. Nourse, Trustee, etc., Petitioners, vs. Maryland Casualty Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

690

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Buckeye Incubator Company and Samuel B. Smith, Petitioners,
693 vs.
Ira M. Petersime and Ray Petersime.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Caroline A. Allison, John Allison and Katherine MacLean, Petitioners,
694 vs.
Harry J. Schnell and Frank V. Baldwin, Executors and Trustees under the Will of William O. Allison, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Virginia Shipbuilding Corporation and Joseph L. Crupper, Receiver in Bankruptcy of Virginia Shipbuilding Corporation, Petitioners,
695 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

O R D E R

1. It is now hereby ordered by this Court that section 7 of rule 29 of this Court be amended by striking therefrom the words "For docketing a case and filing and indorsing the transcript of the record, ten dollars," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "For docketing a case and filing and indorsing the transcript of the record, five dollars."

2. Also, by striking therefrom the words "For preparing the record or a transcript thereof for the printer, in all cases, including records presented with petitions for certiorari, indexing the same, supervising the printing, and distributing the printed copies to the justices, the reporter, the law library, and the parties or their counsel, eight cents per folio of each one hundred words," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "For preparing the record or a transcript thereof for the printer, in all cases, including records presented with petitions for certiorari, indexing the same, supervising the printing, and distributing the printed copies to the justices, the reporter, the law library, and the parties or their counsel, four cents per folio of each one hundred words," but leaving therein unchanged the words "but where the necessary printed copies of the record as printed for the use of the court below are furnished, charges under this item will be limited to any additions printed here under the clerk's supervision."

3. Also by striking therefrom the words "For making a manuscript copy of the record when required under rule 11, twenty cents per folio of each one hundred words, but nothing in addition for supervising the printing," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "For making a manuscript copy of the record when required under rule 11, fifteen cents per folio of each one hundred words, but nothing in addition for supervising the printing."

4. Also, by striking therefrom the words "For filing briefs, five dollars for each party appearing," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "For filing briefs, three dollars for each party appearing."

This order shall apply to causes filed here on or after March 1, 1928, but not to causes filed prior to that date.

T. Tomich, Harry F. Scott, and H. Mulberger, Appellants,
521 vs.
Union Trust Company, a corporation, Spokane & Eastern Trust Company, a corporation.

The motion and stipulation to relax rule and to postpone the printing of the record in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Walsh in behalf of Mr. John A. Shelton for the appellants.

The State of Wisconsin et al., Complainant
7 Original vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.
State of Michigan, Complainant,
11 Original vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
State of New York, Complainant,
12 Original vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The motion to assign these cases for hearing on the exceptions to the report of the special master was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck in that behalf.
On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, four hours were allowed for the oral argument of these cases.

No. 1. Rhederei M. Jebsen Company, appellant, v. The United States.

No. 2. The Firm of M. Jebsen, etc., appellant, v. The United States.

No. 3. Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Co., appellant v. The United States.

No. 4. Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Co., appellant, v. The United States.

No. 5. Atlas Line Steamship Co., appellant, v. The United States.

No. 6. Atlas Line Steamship Co., appellant, v. The United States.

No. 7. North German Lloyd, appellant, v. The United States.

No. 8. North German Lloyd, appellant, v. The United States.

No. 9. North German Lloyd, appellant, v. The United States.

No. 10. Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft (also known as Hamburg-American Line), appellant, v. The United States.

Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft(also known as Hamburg-American Line), Appellant,
11 vs.
The United States.
Deutsche-Australische Dampfschiffs-Gesellschaft, Appellant,
12 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. William D. Devoe for the appellants to pass and reassign these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, reassigned for argument on April 30th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Craven,
Petitioner,
708 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis and Mr. Matthew L. McGrath for the petitioner.

John C. Tobin, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Samuel Ackerman.
John C. Tobin, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
719 vs.
Barnett Kleinman.
John C. Tobin, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
720 vs.
Joseph Goldmuntz et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob M. Lashly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry S. Gleick for the respondents.

Aetna Insurance Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
731 vs.
William R. Baker, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Stone, Mr. R. J. Folonie, Mr. Charles E. Hughes, and Mr. John L. Hunt for the petitioners, and by Mr. William A. Smith, Mr. John G. Egan, and Mr. John P. Rhodes for the respondent.

Joe H. Tiger,
Petitioner,
732 vs.
William M. Fewell et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Neff for the petitioner.

Ira Jewell Williams,
Petitioner,
734 vs.
Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Jr., and Mr. Francis Shunk Brown for the petitioner.

Robert C. Adams,
Petitioner,
737 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Chadbourne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
738 vs.
Mrs. Fannie Skipper, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank P. Pace for the respondent.

W. K. Horton, suing as Guardian, etc., Petitioner,
741 vs.
New York Life Insurance Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry H. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. M. Stevens for the respondent.

Fannie E. Untermyer, as Executrix of Edward D. Untermyer, etc., Petitioner,
221 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States, etc.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Western Gas Construction Company, Plaintiff in error,
223 vs.
Commonwealth of Virginia, at the relation of the State Corporation Commission.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. J. Fulton, Mr. T. J. Michie, Jr., and Mr. John S. Brookes, Jr. for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Leon M. Bazile and Mr. John R. Saunders for the defendant in error.

M. O. Danciger and Emerich Oil Company, Petitioners,
224 vs.
N. K. Smith.

This case was argued by Mr. I. J. Ringolsky for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Jed C. Adams and Mr. W. B. Harrell for the respondent..

H. Plamals,
Petitioner,
225 vs.
The Steamship "Pinar Del Rio," her engines, boilers, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles A. Ellis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cletus Keating for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur E. Young, It is ordered that Edward McCune Borger, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur P. Drury, It is ordered that George R. Sherriff, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Kaufman, It is ordered that Albert T. Bauerle, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that George M. Hagee, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that James H. Bunch, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Benjamin M. Rigler, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith, It is ordered that Leslie Weaver, Esquire, of Thurber, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace R. Lamb, It is ordered that Oscar L. Heltzen, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Thomas E. Williams, Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska, et al., Petitioners.
——,Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh LaMaster for the petitioners.

Cora B. Beatty, executrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. W. D. Stewart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Henry Ellison et al.,
Petitioners,
230 vs.
Max Koswig, trading as F. F. Koswig.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John G. Kaufman for the petitioners, The Court declined to hear further argument.

Texas and New Orleans R. R. Co.,
Petitioner,
231 vs.
Northside Belt Ry. Co.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. H. Tallichet for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Staten Island Rapid Transit Ry. Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
615 vs.
Transit Commission of the State of New York.
Staten Island Rapid Transit Ry. Co., et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
616 vs.
Transit Commission of the State of New York.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Fred H. Wood for the plaintiffs in error. The Court ordered the hearing postponed.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that Mark H. Wight, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that Charles E. Lane, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that John B. Gamble, Esquire, of Athens, State of Georgia, and B. G. Oberry, Jr., Esquire, of Willacoochee, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Reuben S. Douglas and Lawrence R. Lynch, Esquires, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia; W. C. W. Renshaw, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, and Leonard J. Matteson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Lawrence Raymond Rose, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mrs. James A. Swayne,
Plaintiff in error,
256 vs.
City of Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Wills for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. M. Flowers for the defendant in error.

Boston Sand & Gravel Co.,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondent.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Appellant,
79 vs.
Public Service Commission of West Virginia et al.
United Fuel Gas Company, etc.,
et al., Appellants,
19 vs.
Railroad Commission of Kentucky,
et al.

These cases were reassigned for reargument on Monday, October 1st next.

Staten Island Rapid Transit Ry. Co., Plaintiff in error,
615 vs.
Transit Commission of the State of New York.
Staten Island Rapid Transit Ry. Co., et al., Plaintiffs in error,
616 vs.
Transit Commission of the State of New York.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the plaintiffs in error. Further hearing was postponed with leave to counsel to file briefs as to the jurisdiction of this Court within ten days from this date.

Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Plaintiff in error,
70 vs.
W. H. Shanks, as Auditor, etc.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Matthew O'Dogherty, to substitute Clell Coleman, as Auditor, as the party defendant in error in this cause in place of W. H. Shanks, former auditor,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Plaintiff in error,
70 vs.
Clell Coleman, as Auditor, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Matthew O'Dogherty for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Clifford E. Smith for the defendant in error. Leave granted defendant in error to file a supplemental brief by Thursday, March 8th.

A. S. J. Shaw, State Auditor, etc.,
234 vs.
Gibson-Zahnisher Oil Corporation et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. V. P. Crowe for Shaw, State Auditor, etc.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Samuel Marshall Gold, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that James S. Moore, Jr., Esquire, of Berkeley, State of California, and Arthur C. Verge, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Gregory, It is ordered that William N. Foster and E. B. Colgin, Esquires, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that Raymond C. Stanford, Esquire, of Wichita Falls, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. T. Higgins, It is ordered that William Scott Wilkinson, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Wisconsin ex rel. Walter S. Berger, Plaintiff in error,
271 vs.
Wm. J. Cary, as County Clerk, etc.
State of Wisconsin ex rel. Mathilda W. Berger, Plaintiff in error,
272 vs.
Wm. J. Cary, as County Clerk, etc.

These cases were continued per stipulation of counsel.

A. S. J. Shaw, State Auditor, etc.,
234 vs.
Gibson-Zahnisher Oil Corporation et al.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. C. B. Cochran for the Gibson-Zahnisher Oil Corporation et al.

J. W. Hampton, Jr., & Co., Petitioner,
242 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Walter E. Hampton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Mrs. L. E. Williams, individually, etc., Petitioner,
252 vs.
Great Southern Lumber Co.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. H. Generes Dufour for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that William H. Arnold, Jr., Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Graham, It is ordered that James McG. Crockett, Esquire, of Pocomoke City, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eliot C. Lovett, It is ordered that Ben T. Reidy, Esquire, of Rock Island, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mrs. L. E. Williams, individually, etc., Petitioner, 252 vs. Great Southern Lumber Company.	The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. A. T. Higgins for the petitioner.
City of New Brunswick et al., etc., Petitioners, 260 vs. United States of America & U. S. Housing Corporation.	This case was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondents.
St. Louis & Southwestern Ry. Co., Appellant, 263 vs. J. H. Mattin, Tax Collector, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Alaska Packers Association, Petitioner, 266 vs. Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and John Peterson.	This case was argued by Mr. Blair S. Shuman for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. C. Faulkner for the respondents.
Aileen E. Mitchell as Treasurer of Fort Bend County, Texas, et al., Petitioners, 269 vs. J. W. Hampel, et al. trustees in Bankruptcy, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. T. W. Gregory for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. B. Colgin for the respondents, with leave to counsel to file additional briefs.

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, It is ordered that Augustus J. Harris, Esquire, of Decatur, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Douglas Arant, It is ordered that Richard Taylor Rives, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, It is ordered that Albert Henry Veeder, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Hazell, It is ordered that Francis B. Leech, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Hazell, It is ordered that Carl T. Mack, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Russell A. Hart, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Delano Putnam, It is ordered that Gerald J. Callahan, Esquire, of Holyoke, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Wilson, It is ordered that Edward E. Mitchell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy C. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Augustus L. Gebhard, Esquire, of Bryan, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dill, It is ordered that Charles W. Greenough, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dill, It is ordered that Algernon O. Colburn, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic B. Scott, It is ordered that William Hogencamp Wurts, Esquire, of Hackensack, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry W. McMaster and Francis H. Skelding, as Receivers of the Wabash Pittsburgh Terminal Railway Company, Petitioners,
85 vs.
George J. Gould, Kingdon Gould, et al., as Executors, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Stone did not sit in this case.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

6 Original vs.

The State of Texas,

Defendant,

The United States of America,

Intervener.

ORDER

Upon consideration of the responses to the rule to show cause issued on January 9, 1928, it is ordered, adjudged, and decreed that clause 1 of the decree entered in this cause on January 3, 1927 (273 U.S. 93), be and is changed so as to read as follows:

"1. The boundary between the State of Texas and the State of Oklahoma constituting the eastern boundary of the Panhandle of Texas and the main western boundary of Oklahoma is the line of the true one hundredth meridian of longitude west from Greenwich, extending north from its intersection with the south bank of the South Fork of Red River to its intersection with the northern boundary line of the State of Texas as surveyed and marked upon the ground by John H. Clark, United States commissioner, under the act of June 5, 1858, ch. 92, or with a line running due east from the eastern terminus of the Clark survey it if is west of the meridian."

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this order to the Governors of Texas and Oklahoma, the Secretary of the Interior, and Samuel S. Gannett, commissioner, respectively.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Harry Levy, Bankrupt,

Petitioner,

217 vs.

Industrial Finance Corporation, Metropolitan Trust Company, and Chatham & Phenix National Bank of New York City.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed

by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

T. Tomich, Harry F. Scott, and H. Mulberger, Appellants,
521 vs.
Union Trust Company, a corporation, and Spokane & Eastern Trust Company, a corporation.

Upon consideration of the motion of the appellants that subdivision 2 of Rule 11 of this Court be suspended and that they shall not be required to deposit with the Clerk the sum necessary for the printing of the record herein until further order of the Court,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, such suspension to continue until the first Monday in November next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 7, Original. State of Wisconsin, State of Minnesota, State of Ohio, and State of Pennsylvania, Complainants, vs. State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, Defendants, State of Missouri, State of Kentucky, State of Tennessee, et al., Intervening defendants.

No. 11, Original. State of Michigan, complainant, vs. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

Upon consideration of the motion to assign these cases for hearing on the exceptions to the report of the Special Master,

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, set down for hearing on these exceptions on April 23 next. Four hours oral argument will be allowed to the States excepting to the report of the Special Master, and two and one-half hours oral argument will be allowed to the

Ex Parte:
In the Matter of Thomas E. Williams Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska, et al.,
Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Thomas E. Williams, Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska, et al.,
Petitioners.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the Honorable Joseph W. Woodrough, Judge of the United Stated District Court for the District of Nebraska, Omaha Division, do show cause in printed form, if any cause there be, why a writ of mandamus should not issue out of this Court requiring him to call to his assistance two other Federal judges, as provided for by section 266 of the Judicial Code as amended by the act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat.. 936, 938) [illegible] and determine the case herein at the final hearing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Gas Construction Company,
Plaintiff in error,
223 vs.
Commonwealth of Virginia at the Relation of the State Corporation Commission.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cora B. Beatty, Executrix of the
Last Will and Testament of John
W. Beatty, deceased,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal
Revenue of the Twenty-third District
of the United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Henry Ellison, William R. Ellison,
and Howard B. Ellison, Jr.,
Individually, et al.,
Petitioners,
230 vs.
Max Koswig, Trading as F. F. Koswig.

On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

The grounds which were presented in the petition for certiorari, because of which the writ of certiorari was granted, do not prove to have a substantial basis in the record because of the lack of assignments of error therein showing the proper presentation of federal questions to the Superior Court of the State,

It is therefore ordered that the writ of certiorari heretofore granted in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. James A. Swayne,

Plaintiff in error,

256 vs.

City of Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lillian Weare,

Petitioner,

709 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that the Solicitor General, in behalf of the respondent, has confessed error in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said confession of error, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota with directions to dismiss the case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lillian Weare,

Petitioner,

709 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
Robert H. Lenson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
707 vs.
Carl C. Peterson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Gleason, doing business as John W. Gleason Cotton Company,
Petitioner,
715 vs.
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Austin Morley, Eugene H. McCarthy,
Robert C. Sweatt, et al.,
Petitioners,
691 vs.
Herbert A. Wilson, Police Commissioner of the City of Boston.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris & Company,
Petitioner,
698 vs.
K. Ikuno, Master and Claimant of the Steamship "Naples Maru."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Greater New York Dock & Warehouse Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
Stapleton Dock & Warehouse Corporation and The City of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Knickerbocker Fuel Company,

Petitioner,

703 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Washington on the Relation of Crooker Perry and Leonora Perry, his wife, Petitioners,

704 vs.

The Superior Court of the State of Washington for the County of Chelan The Honorable W. O. Parr, Judge, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marion and Eastern Railroad Company, Petitioner,

706 vs.

Illinois Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Craven,
Petitioner,
708 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordred by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. S. McCray,
Petitioner,
710 vs.
J. A. Fulp, Receiver for the Sapulpa Petroleum Company and Sapulpa Petroleum Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Martine Ginal,
Petitioner,
711 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordred by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Quinlan, W. W. Brown, Will Stuckey, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 713

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abraham Buckspan, Petitioner, vs. The Hudson's Bay Company. 714

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Tobin, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Morris Singer, Petitioner, vs. Samuel Ackerman. 718

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Tobin, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Morris Singer, Petitioner, vs. Samuel Ackerman. 718

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Tobin, Trustee in Bankruptcy, of the Estate of Morris Singer, Petitioner, vs. Barnett Kleinman. 719

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Tobin, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Morris Singer, Petitioner, vs. Joseph Goldmuntz, et al. 720

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Duluth & Iron Range Railroad Company, Petitioner,
724 vs.
The City of Duluth.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Josiah T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia, Petitioner,
726 vs.
Nunnally Investment Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Insurance Company, Agricultural Insurance Company, Allemannia Fire Insurance Company, et al., Petitioners,
731 vs.
William R. Baker, Superintendent of Insurance, State of Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe H. Tiger,

Petitioner,

732 vs.

William M. Fewell, William Kopp, Augusta Jacobson, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ira Jewell Williams,

Petitioner,

734 vs.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert C. Adams,

Petitioner,

737 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

738 vs.

Mrs. Fannie Skipper, Administratrix of the Estate of W. A. Skipper, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. K. Horton, suing as Guardian for Lucinda Horton, Rosa Horton, et al., Minors,

Petitioners,

741 vs.

New York Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut,
Petitioner,
190 vs.
Arthur Silberman, Charles Meobius, Joseph Plant, et al., executors.
Arthur Silberman, Charles Meobius, Joseph Plant, et al., executors, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
191 vs.
William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, of the State of Connecticut.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. H. H. Shelton in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of William R. Perkins, Sol M. Stroock, and Forrest Hyde, as amici curiae in these cases.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant
14 Original vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. F. Delano Putnam in that behalf, leave was granted to file an answer in this case.

Benjamin Russell, J. M. Steverson, T. C. Russell, et al.,
Petitioners,
730 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod, leave was granted to file a brief of J. Robert Sherrod, Joseph D. Peeler, and Ward Loveless, as amici curiae in this case.

Wyandotte Terminal Railroad Company, Petitioner,
725 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Don P. Reed for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Benjamin Russell, J. M. Steverson, T. C. Russell, et al., Petitioners,
730 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Douglas Arant and Mr. Wm. S. Pritchard for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Ralph E. Smith for the respondent.

The State of Washington ex rel. Mike Lukich, alias Yukij, Joe Bolen, and Mark Duich, Petitioners,
733 vs.
Superior Court of the State of Washington for King County and Calvin S. Hall, Judge thereof.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Howard A. Hanson for the respondents.

The United States of America ex rel. Isabel London, Petitioners,
735 vs.
Clifford D. Phelps, United States Immigration Inspector.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

A. Leo Weil and Charles M. Thorp, doing business under the firm name and style of Weil & Thorp, Petitioners,
736 vs.
Edward M. Neary.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Leo Weil for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis Marshall for the respondent.

Synthetic Patents Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
742 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lyttleton Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Robert W. Bonygne, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the respondent.

Synthetic Patents Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
743 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lyttleton Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Robert W. Bonynge, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the respondent.

James A. Reed, Charles L. McNary, William H. King, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
744 vs.
The County Commissioners of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, The Prothonotary of Delaware County, and John J. Sailing, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jerry C. South for the petitioners.

George Tazewell, as Presiding Judge of the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for Multnomah County, Petitioner,
746 vs.
The State of Oregon ex rel. Edward Sullivan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Erskine Wood for the petitioners and by Mr. Wallace McCamant for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
747 vs.
C. M. Tyner, as Administrator of George A. Marshall, deceased.

Lionel K. Legge for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Simeon Hyde for the petitioner, and by Mr.

The Barker Painting Company, Petitioner,
749 vs.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Vincent A. Sheehy for the respondents.

W. A. Ledbetter, G. V. Pardue, W. A. Watson, et al., Petitioners,
750 vs.
Elias Wesley et al., and the United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, Mr. H. L. Stuart, Mr. R. R. Bell, Mr. E. P. Ledbetter, Mr. H. A. Ledbetter, and Mr. L. A. Ledbetter for the petitioners, and by Mr. Chas. E. McPherren for the respondents Elias Wesley et al., and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter for the respondent the United States of America.

Samuel Thomas Walkup,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Thomas Walkup, pro se.

Elmer B. Jeffries,
Petitioner,
755 vs.
Sam L. Gross, United States Marshal for the Northern District of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Harrell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Charles Forbes,
Petitioner,
756 vs.
Sam L. Gross, United States Marshal for the Northern District of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Harrell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

D. H. Keane,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
F. T. Gauen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore Mack for the petitioner.

Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Company, Petitioner
762 vs.
C. R. Wilson Body Company and Paul E. Breneman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr. for the petitioner, and by Mr. William J. Belknap and Mr. Clarence B. Zewadski for the respondents.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
771 vs.
Standard Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Morrow for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar Sutro and Mr. Louis Titus for the respondent.

C..P. and S. J. Beaty, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
301 vs.
W. S. Richardson, Tax Collector of Fulton County, Georgia.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Church for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. George M. Napier and Mr. T. R. Gress for the defendant in error.

Sultan Railway & Timber Company, Plaintiff in error,
274 vs.
Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington and Claire Bowman, as Director of Labor and Industries.

Eclipse Mill Company, Plaintiff in error,
275 vs.
Department of Labor and Industries of the State of Washington and Claire Bowman as Director of Labor and Industries.

These cases were argued by Mr. Mark H. Wight for the defendants in error, and submitted by Mr. Frederic E. Fuller for the plaintiffs in error.

Panhandle Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error.
288 vs.
The State of Mississippi, on relation of R. H. Knox, Attorney General.

This case was argued by Mr. George Butler for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. L. Byrd for the defendant in error.

Peninsula Produce Exchange,
Plaintiff in error,
291 vs.
New York, Philadelphia and Norfolk Railroad Company, and The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. M. Crockett for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Arthur E. Hoffman, as executor of the Estate of Fred H. Slatmeyer, deceased,
Plaintiff in error,
292 vs.
The Industrial Commission of Ohio.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. William H. Miller for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

Arthur E. Hoffman, as executor of the Estate of Fred H. Slatmeyer, deceased,
Plaintiff in error,
292 vs.
The Industrial Commission of Ohio.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frank H. Ward for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The C. A. King & Company,
Plaintiff in error,
296 vs.
D. O. Horton.
D. O. Horton,
Plaintiff in error,
304 vs.
The C. A. King Company.

These cases were argued by Mr. Morris Townley for the C. A. King & Company, and by Mr. A. L. Gebhard for Horton.

The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission and
Fort Smith, Subiaco & Rock Island
Railroad Company,
Appellants,
607 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States of America and continued by Mr. H. H. Larrimore for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Jos. C. Schroeder, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Thomas E. Elcock, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Edwin L. Waugh, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warner I. Cubberly, It is ordered that John M. Mason, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that J. Sheldon Frost, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis C. Sears, It is ordered that Clement L. Waldron, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Louis & Southwestern Ry. Co., Appellant,
263 vs.
J. H. Nattin, Tax Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Zach Spearing in behalf of counsel for the appellant, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief for the appellant within ten days.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission et al., Appellants,
607 vs.
Missouri Pacific R. R. Co.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. H. H. Larimore for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Josephine Stipcich
97 vs.
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Chester I. Long for Stipcich, and by Mr. F. Eldred Boland for the Metropolitan Insurance Company.

Beatrice Grayson Johnson, Petitioner,
297 vs.
Wright Thornburgh, as the Administrator, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. A. L. Emery for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman J. Galloway, It is ordered that McClure Kelley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that W. R. Wallace, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, It is ordered that Leon M. Fisk, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Beatrice Grayson Johnson,
Petitioner,
297 vs.
Wright Thornburgh, as the Administrator etc., et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. A. L. Emery for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Standard Pipe Line Co., Inc., et al., Plaintiffs in error,
319 vs.
Commissioners of Index Sulphur Drainage District et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William H. Arnold for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument. Leave was granted to counsel to file briefs on application for a writ of certiorari within two weeks.

Mutual Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
321 vs.
Edgar M. Wright, as Guardian, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Douglas Arant for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.,
Petitioner,
341 vs.
James R. Tindle, et al., coexecutors, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the petitioner, and by Mr. James Walton for the respondents.

Kraus Brothers Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
342 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Brenton K. Fisk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alex M. Bull for the respondants.

Claude L. Hemphill,

Plaintiff in error,

343 vs.

Julia Stott Orloff.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles A. Wagner for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam C. Bratton, It is ordered that Grace McDonald Phillips, of Roswell, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. R. Whittington, It is ordered that J. H. Sumrall, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that Edward B. Klemer, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Claude L. Hemphill,
Plaintiff in error,
343 vs.
Julia Stott Orloff.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles A. Wagner for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Isadore Levin for the defendant in error.

Hubert Work, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
344 vs.
Robert L. Braffet, Administrator, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Walter Edmund Burke for the respondent. Leave was granted the respondent to file a brief within one week on motion of Mr. W. W. Ross in behalf of counsel for the respondent.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
349 vs.
Franklin Jones, Administrator, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. A. W. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in error,
364 vs.
State of Wisconsin.
New York Life Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error,
365 vs.
State of Wisconsin.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. J. Gilbert Hardgrove for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland, Associate Justices.

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Jones, It is ordered that Karl M. Geddes, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Jones, It is ordered that Bruce R. Leydig, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Clague, It is ordered that Frank Yetka, Esquire, of Cloquet, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Wilkinson, It is ordered that Lewis A. R. Innerarity, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huston Thompson, It is ordered that Myles P. Tallmadge, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wright Clark, It is ordered that John de R. Storey, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Colorado,

Complainant,

15 Original. vs.

State of Kansas and The Finney County Water Users' Association.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, leave was granted the complainant to file a brief in opposition to the motion to dismiss, on or before May 1.

The United States of America, ex rel. Isabel London,

Petitioner,

735 vs.

Clifford D. Phelps, United States Immigration Inspector.

The motion for leave to file a supplemental brief for the petitioner was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Council in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, and the motion was denied.

The John P. King Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in error,
392 vs.
City Council of Augusta and Raleigh H. Daniel, Mayor, etc.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Bryan Cumming to substitute William B. Bell, present mayor, as a party defendant in error in place of Raleigh H. Daniel, former mayor, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Plaintiff in error,
364 vs.
The State of Wisconsin.
New York Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in error,
365 vs.
The State of Wisconsin.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. P. Gilbert Hard, rove for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

C. F. DeCraff, as Treasurer, etc., Plaintiff in error,
366 vs.
City of Spokane, Washington.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. C. W. Greenough for the plaintiff in error; and continued by Mr. A. O. Colburn for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Midland Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
375 vs.
Thomas Barkley, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Charles I. Evans for the respondents.

John J. Mitchell et al., executors,

Petitioners,

376 vs.

The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. A. Lowry Humes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Howard Moore,

Petitioner,

384 vs.

City of Nampa.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. M. P. Tallmadge for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest L. Averill, It is ordered that Thomas R. FitzSimmons, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Louis Smith, It is ordered that Hugh C. Bickford, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Jensen, It is ordered that Paul H. Ray, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Holt, It is ordered that Thomas West Peyton IV, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, It is ordered that Sardius M. Brewster, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude Pollard, It is ordered that C. G. Calhoun, Esquire, of Tyler, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company,
Inc., Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Court
159 vs. of Claims.
The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Sutherland, and Mr. Justice Stone.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

C. P. and S. J. Beaty et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

301 vs.

W. S. Richardson, Tax Collector of Fulton County, Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peninsula Produce Exchange,

Plaintiff in error,

291 vs.

New York, Philadelphia and Norfolk Railroad Company and The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur E. Hoffman, as Executor of the Estate of Fred H. Blatmeyer, deceased, Plaintiff in error,

292 vs.

The Industrial Commission of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and on a motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Cout that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

The C. A. King & Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

296 vs. State of Ohio.

D. O. Horton.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. O. Horton,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

304 vs. State of Ohio.

The C. A. King Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beatrice Grayson Johnson,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

297 vs. Court of the State of Oklahoma.

Wright Thornburgh, as the Administrator of the Estate of Anna C. Thornburgh, Deceased; Wright Thornburgh, by his Guardian, etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Pipe Line Company, Inc., et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. Commissioners of Index Sulphur Drainage District. 319

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner, vs. Edgar M. Wright, as Guardian of Nettie T. Henderson, a Minor. 321

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Mutual Life Insurance Company
of New York, Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of
364 vs. the State of Wisconsin.
State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of
365 vs. the State of Wisconsin.
State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. F. DeGraff, as Treasurer of
Spokane County, Washington,
Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of
366 vs. the State of Washington.
The City of Spokane, Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Russell, J. M. Steverson, T. C. Russell, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 730

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Reed, Charles L. McNary, William H. King, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. The County Commissioners of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, The Prothonotary of Delaware County and John J. Sailing, etc., et al. 744

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Tazewell, as Presiding Judge of the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for Multnomah County, Petitioner, vs. The State of Oregon ex rel. Edward Sullivan. 746

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
747 vs.
C. M. Tyner, as Administrator of George A. Marshall, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
771 vs.
Standard Oil Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wyandotte Terminal Railroad Company, Petitioner,
725 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Washington, ex rel.
Mike Lukich, alias Yukij, Joe Bolen
and Mark Duich, Petitioners,
733 vs.
Superior Court of the State of
Washington for King County and
Calvin S. Hall, Judge thereof.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
ex rel. Isabel London,
Petitioner,
735 vs.
Clifford D. Phelps, United States
Immigration Inspector.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Synthetic Patents Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

742 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Synthetic Patents Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

743 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Barker Painting Company,
Petitioner,
749 vs.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Ledbetter, G. V. Pardue, W. A. Watsnn, et al., Petitioners,
750 vs.
Elias Wesley, Austin McGee, Jesse McGee, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Thomas Walkup,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmer B. Jeffries,

Petitioner,

755 vs.

Sam L. Cross, United States Marshal for the Northern District of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Apppeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles E. Forbes,

Petitioner,

756 vs.

Sam L. Cross, United States Marshal for the Northern District of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. H. Keene,

Petitioner,

760 vs.

F. T. Gauen.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
762 vs.
C. R. Wilson Body Company and Paul E. Breneman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

The Court will adjourn at the conclusion of the arguments of the cases on the call for today, until Monday next, March 19, and will take a recess from that day until Monday, April 9, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Journeymen Stone Cutters Association of North America, Michael W. Mitchell and Joseph Wall, Appellants,
788 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
615 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.
The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company and The Staten Island Railway Company, Plaintiffs in error,
616 vs.

The motion to amend the writs of error in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Howland Chase for the plaintiffs in error.

Must Hatch Incubator Co., Inc.,
Appellant,
634 vs.
I. L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon, et al.

The motion to reassign this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood H. Seal in that behalf.

Daniel V. Harkin and Union Bank of Chicago, Receivers, etc.,
Petitioners,
117 vs.
Edward J. Brundage, Receiver, etc., et al.

The motion to amend the opinion in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Jackson Darby for the respondents.

Lucy B. Brooke,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
City of Norfolk, R. W. Peatross, A. Plummer Pannill, et al.

The joint motion to restore this case to the call was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Warren Wall in that behalf.

A. B. Caplinger, as County Judge of Poinsett County, Arkansas,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
United States on relation of Harriman National Bank.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell for the respondents.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut,
Petitioner,
190 vs.
Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius, et al.
Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
191 vs.
William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Seth T. Cole, leave was granted to file a brief on behalf of the Tax Commission of the State of New York and The Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as amici curiae in these cases.
The motion for oral argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Seth T. Cole.

Rickmers Rhederei Actien Gesellschaft, Petitioner,
754 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reeves T. Strickland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the respondents.

Babcock Printing Press Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
761 vs.
Robert L. Murphy, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. P. Bachman for the petitioner.

W. D. Dilbeck et al., Petitioners,
772 vs.
The State of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, Third Supreme Judicial District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Rutledge, Jr., and Mr. R. L. Batts for the petitioners.

Manufacturers' Finance Company, Petitioner,
775 vs.
Frederick S. Foster, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harrison J. Barrett, Mr. Lee M. Friedman, Mr. Percy A. Atherton, and Mr. George W. Reed, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. B. Cook for the respondent.

Seth B. Orndorff, Lee H. Orndorff, et al., Petitioners,
777 vs.
El Paso County, Texas, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, Eighth Supreme Judicial District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Dennis for the petitioners.

Lorenzo Veneti
Petitioner,
778 vs.
Charles H. Draper, Receiver of and for the First National Bank of Matoaka.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell S. Ritz for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. M. Neely for the respondent.

Epmin Mariotti,
Petitioner,
779 vs.
Charles H. Draper, Receiver of and for the First National Bank of Matoaka.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell S. Ritz for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. M. Neely for the respondent.

Home Insurance Company, of New York, Petitioner,
780 vs.
Lakin C. Hightower and Winston S. Garth, partners under the Firm and Style of Hightower & Garth.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex W. Spence and Mr. C. M. Smithdeal for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. J. Harris for the respondent.

Edith E. Kelley,
Appellant,
830 vs.
James Compton et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and motion for an order that the record be printed at public expense in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Edith E. Kelley, pro se.

No. 407. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. Alice M. Ramsey, et al.

No. 408. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. Alice M. Ramsey et al.

No. 409. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. W. O. James et al.

No. 410. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. W. O. James et al.

No. 411. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. Ramsey Petroleum Company, et al.

No. 412. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. Ramsey Petroleum Company, et al.

No. 413. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. G. L. Ramsey, et al.

No. 414. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. G. L. Ramsey et al.

No. 415. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. M. R. Chastain et al.

No. 416. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. M. R. Chastain et al.

No. 417. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. A. L. Lloyd et al.

C. L. Harris, as executor, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
418 vs.
A. L. Lloyd et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Jones for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. L. J. Bond, Mr. S. M. Brewster, Mr. John L. Hunt, and Mr. Bruce A. Campbell, for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

Bank of Indianola, D. L. Bingham, et al., Plaintiffs in error, 387 vs. W. J. Miller, Revenue Agent, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. J. H. Sumrall for the defendant in error, and submitted by Mr. Cary C. Moody for the plaintiffs in error.
Max M. Tannenbaum and Hannah N. Tannenbaum, both individually, etc., Plaintiffs in error, 388 vs. John J. O'Niell, Inheritance Tax Collector, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Benjamin Y. Wolf for the plaintiffs in error, and submitted by Mr. Harry Gamble for the defendant in error.
A. R. Young Construction Company et al., Plaintiffs in error, 391 vs. D. E. Dunne et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Willard Brooks for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
The John P. King Manufacturing Company, Plaintiff in error, 392 vs. The City Council of Augusta and William B. Bell, Mayor, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Bryan Cumming for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. E. H. Callaway for the defendants in error.
George A. Wilcox, Plaintiff in error, 399 vs. George B. Munger, Tax Collector, etc., et al. George A. Wilcox, Plaintiff in error, 400 vs. Town of Madison et al.	This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Beers for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Ernest L. Averill and Mr. Thomas R. RitzSimmons for the defendants in error.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc.,

Petitioner,

190 vs.

Arthur Silberman et al., executors.

Arthur Silberman et al., executors,
Plaintiffs in error,

191 vs.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Abraham L. Gutman for Silberman et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Harvey, It is ordered that Thomas F. Bolan, Jr., Esquire, of Clarendon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Davis, It is ordered that R. Morton Adams, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Davis, It is ordered that Merton W. Sage, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Gwynn Gardiner, It is ordered that Wm. E. Mann, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Felix Forte, Esquire, of Somerville, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathaniel T. Guernsey, It is ordered that N. T. Guernsey, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger Shale, It is ordered that Gertrude Farber Newman and Adolph M. Newman, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that W. Lon Johnson, Esquire, of Colville, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur G. Free, It is ordered that Cecil H. Riley, Esquire, of North Fork, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc., Petitioner, 190 vs. Arthur Silberman, et al., executors. Arthur Silberman et al., executors, Plaintiffs in error, 191 vs. William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner, etc.	The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for Blodgett, by Mr. Seth T. Cole for the Tax Commission of the State of New York and the Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the State of Massachusetts as amici curiae, by special leave of Court; and concluded by Mr. Kenneth Dayton for Silberman et al.
Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Columbia, South Carolina, Petitioner, 456 vs. Chas. S. Mitchell, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. D. W. Robinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. George L. Buist for the respondents.
United States of America, 610 vs. John Barth Co. & U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co.	This case was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the United States, and by Mr. M. K. Whyte and Mr. Louis Quarles for the John Barth Co. et al.
F. M. Ring, Plaintiff in error, 663 vs. The State of Oregon.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas Mannix for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Holt, It is ordered that D. E. French, Esquire, of Bluefield, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund H. Parry, It is ordered that Olen E. Bee, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Hamel, It is ordered that Jay C. Halls, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Edward H. McDermott, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that S. S. Orwig, Esquire, of Wewoka, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

F. M. Ring,
Plaintiff in error,
663 vs.
The State of Oregon.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Thomas Mannix and Mr. E. W. Wickey for the plaintiff in error, The Court declined to hear further argument.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
Petitioner,
98 vs.
K. S. Leitch.

This case was reargued by Mr. Douglas W. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Holt for the respondent.

Holland Furniture Company,
Petitioner,
285 vs.
Perkins Glue Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Hogsett, It is ordered that William H. Boyd and Leslie Nichols, Esquires, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that Harvey Carroll Ray, Esquire of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Knight, It is ordered that Frederick H. Knight, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene M. Burr, It is ordered that John R. Dowlan, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Holland Furniture Company,

Petitioner,

285 vs.

Perkins Glue Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gorham Crosby for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner. Leave was granted the respondent until Tuesday next to file a supplemental brief and petitioner was allowed to file a reply thereto within three days thereafter.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, It is ordered that William W. Hill, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Thomas Taylor, It is ordered that Herman Vandermart and Victor A. Hart, Esquires, of Hackensack, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellorsof this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, It is ordered that John H. Morris, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, It is ordered that Charles F. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that James F. X.O'Brien, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander M. Bull, It is ordered that James M. Chaney, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that Clair M. Senior, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville D. Church, It is ordered that Lawrence D. Blair, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Swift & Company et al., and Armour & Company et al., 181 vs. The United States of America.

On a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court thatthe decree of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia overruling the motions of the defendants to vacate the decree entered February 27, 1920 in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that

this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Fairbanks, Morse & Co. and Sheffield Car Company, Petitioners, vs. American Valve & Meter Company and Edward E. Johnson. 262

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed bythis Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, each party to pay its own costs; and thatthis cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Aileen E. Mitchell, (Successor of C. Minkwitz, Former Treasurer of Fort BendCounty, Texas) as Treasurer of Fort Bend County, Texas, et al., Petitioners, vs. J. W. Hampel et al., Trustees in Bankruptcy, etc., et al. 269

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed

by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Franklin Jones, Administrator of the Estate of D. R. Ferguson, deceased.

349

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause, be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

In re: Abraham S. Gilbert.

Upon consideration of the proceedings for disbarment or contempt herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that Abraham S. Gilbert be, and he is hereby, suspended from his rights and privileges as a member of the bar of this Court for six months from this day and that he pay the costs of this proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Journeymen Stone Cutters Association of North America, Michael W. Mitchell and Joseph Wall, Appellants,
788 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
615 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.

In error to the Transit Commission of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Transit Commission of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Sanford and Mr. Justice Stone entertain a different view.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company and the Staten Island Railway Company,
Plaintiff in error,
616 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.

In error to the Transit Commission of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from th Transit Commission of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Sanford, and Mr. Justice Stone entertain a different view.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company, Plaintiff in error,
615 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motions to amend the writ of error, or for other appropriate relief in the premises, or that the writ of error be treated as a petition for certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company and The Staten Island Railway Company, Plaintiffs in error,
616 vs.
The Transit Commission of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motions to amend the writ of error, or for other appropriate relief in the premises, or that the writ of error be treated as a petition for certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Must Hatch Incubator Co., Inc., Appellant,
634 vs.
I. L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon, I. H. Van Winkle, Attorney General of the State of Oregon, W. H. Lytle, etc.

Upon consideration of the motion to continue this case, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is reassigned for argument on Monday, October 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lucy B. Brooke,

Petitioner,

229 vs.

City of Norfolk, R. W. Peatross, A. Plummer Pannill, et al.

Upon consideration of the joint motion to restore this case to the call, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. B. Caplinger, as County Judge of Poinsett County, Arkansas,

Petitioner,

538 vs.

United States on relation of Harriman National Bank.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell, of counsel, in behalf of respondent, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edith E. Kelley,

Appellant,

830 vs.

James Compton et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

Upon consideration of the unprinted record herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edith E. Kelley,

Appellant,

830 vs.

James Compton, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel V. Harkin and Union Bank of Chicago, Receivers, etc.,

Petitioners,

117 vs.

Edward J. Brundage, Receiver, etc., et al.

Upon consideration of the motion to amend the opinion already filed in this case, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted as to one addition on page eleven, and denied in other respects.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bank of Indianola, D. L. Bingham, E. A. Tanner, et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

387 vs.

W. J. Miller, Revenue Agent of the State of Mississippi, suing for the use and benefit of Sunflower County, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max M. Tannenbaum and Hannah M. Tannenbaum, both individually and as Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. John J. O'Niell, Inheritance Tax Collector, Parish of Orleans, State of Louisiana. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

388

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. R. Young Construction Company and Cecil L. Newbold, Receiver, Plaintiffs in error, vs. D. E. Dunne, G. C. Dunne, and G. M. Dunne, Partners, etc. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

391

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. R. Young Construction Company and Cecil L. Newbold, Receiver, Petitioners, vs. D. E. Dunne, G. C. Dunne, and G. M. Dunne, Partners, etc. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

391

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had.

George A. Wilcox,

Plaintiff in error,

399 vs.

George B. Munger, Tax Collector of the Town of Madison, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George A. Wilcox,

Plaintiff in error,

400 vs.

Town of Madison et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

610 vs. On a certificate from the United

The John Barth Company and United States Circuit Court of Appeals for

States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said certificate be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. M. Ring,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

663 vs. State of Oregon.

The State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wallace C. Gaines,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

841 vs. State of Washington.

The State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wallace C. Gaines,
Plaintiff in error,
841 vs.
The State of Washington.

Upon consideration of the writ of error heretofore allowed in this cause, and treating said writ as a petition for writ of certiorari under section 237 (c) of the Judicial Code, as amended by the act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 936, 938)

It is now here ordered by this Court that Wallace C. Gaines do show cause before this Court on April 23rd next, if any cause there be, by printed return and printed brief, why the petition for writ of certiorari herein should not be denied for lack of a substantial federal question shown in the record giving this Court jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Leo Weil and Charles M. Thorp, doing business under the firm name and style of Weil & Thorp,
Petitioners,
736 vs.
Edward M. Neary.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rickmers Rhederei Actien Gesellschaft,
Petitioner,
754 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Babcock Printing Press Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
761 vs.
Robert L. Murphy, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Press Printers & Publishers, Inc., Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. D. Dilbeck, et al., Petitioners,
772 vs.
The State of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 3rd Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 3rd Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Manufacturers' Finance Company, Petitioner,
775 vs.
Frederick S. Foster, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seth B. Orndorff, Lee H. Orndorff, Charles DeGroff, et al., Petitioners,

777 vs.

El Paso County, Texas, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 8th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 8th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lorenzo Veneri, Petitioner,

778 vs.

Charles H. Draper, Receiver of and for the First National Bank of Matoaka.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ermin Mariotti, Petitioner,

779 vs.

Charles H. Draper, Receiver of and for the First National Bank of Matoaka.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Home Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
780 vs.
Lakin C. Hightower and Winston S. Garth, partners under the Firm and Style of Hightower & Garth.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George W. P. Hunt, as Governor of the State of Arizona; D. E. Pettis, as Game Warden, etc., et al., Appellants,
697 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed out of time, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lloyd Littrell, Receiver of the First National Bank of Carnegie, Plaintiff in error,
172 vs.
Peter G. Cameron, Secretary of Banking, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing herein out of time under Rule 30, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
2 Original. vs.
The State of Texas.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. J. Harry Covington, leave was granted to file a reply brief of the State of New Mexico in this case.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
584 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company, Edwin L. Belshe, Robert B. Stout, et al.,

The motion to set this case for hearing on the merits was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se, and the motion was denied.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
584 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company, Edwin L. Belshe, Robert B. Stout, et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition for diminution of the record offered by appellant in case No. 631 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se, and the motion was denied.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company,

The motion to set this case for hearing on the merits was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se, and the motion was denied.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

The motion to correct the marking of the printed record in this Court was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se, and the motion was denied.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

The motion for leave to file the petition and brief offered by the petitioner on February 20, 1928, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. F. Vance, pro se, and the motion was denied.

The United States,
Petitioner,
700 vs.
The Cambridge Loan and Building Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the respondent.

Anna Louise Nolde,
Petitioner,
739 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter E. Barton and Mr. Harry F. Kantner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
770 vs.
Morgan L. Davis, as Administrator of the Estate of W. Baylor Richards, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Henry H. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thos. H. Peeples for the respondent.

Stuyvesant Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
773 vs.
Jacksonville Oil Mill.

The Globe and Rutgers Fire Insurance Company, Petitioners,
774 vs.
Jacksonville Oil Mill.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bruce Barnett for the petitioners, and by Mr. William P. Metcalf for the respondent.

John Thomas Gillespie and Samuel Hassard Gillespie, carrying on business under the firm name and style of L. C. Gillespie & Sons,
Petitioners,
776 vs.
Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hogan and Mr. Elkan Turk for the petitioners, and by Mr. Garret W. McEnerney and Mr. Andrew F. Burke for the respondent.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
Louis Ilfeld Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Lacey, Mr. N. H. Loomis, and Mr. Herbert V. Lacey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carle Whitehead and Mr. Albert L. Vogl for the respondent.

Oliver Chapman, as License Collector of the City of St. Louis, Petitioner,
784 vs.
International Shoe Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver Senti, Mr. Julius Muench, and Mr. George F. Haid for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank Y. Gladney for the respondent.

Armour and Company, Petitioner,
785 vs.
Bassell Brothers, a copartnership composed of Neal Bassel, A. J. Bassel, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt, Mr. Chas. J. Faulkner, Jr., and Mr. Alfred S. Austrian for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. L. Curtis for the respondents.

Armour and Company, Petitioner,
786 vs.
The Belton National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt, Mr. Chas. J. Faulkner, Jr., and Mr. Alfred S. Austrian for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. L. Curtis for the respondent.

William H. Hardie, Petitioner,
787 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph E. Pottle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Jesse McGee, Sallie McGee, Elias Wesley, et al., Petitioners,
790 vs.
W. A. Ledbetter, G. V. Pardue, W. A. Watson, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Lydick for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, Mr. E. P. Ledbetter, Mr. H. L. Stuart, Mr. R. R. Bell, Mr. L. A. Ledbetter, and Mr. H. A. Ledbetter for the respondents.

Guiseppe Yaconi, Petitioner,
792 vs.
Brady & Gioe, Inc.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas B. Axtell and Mr. William F. Purdy for the petitioner.

Katie Roubedeaux and Lizzie Gibbs, nee Brink, heirs at law, et al., Petitioners,
793 vs.
Quaker Oil & Gas Company of Oklahoma, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Smith, Mr. Thos. D. McKeown, and Mr. Jno. S. Barbour for the petitioners, and by Mr. George S. Ramsey, Mr. Alvin Richards, Mr. L. C. Lytle, Mr. T. J. Flannelly, and Mr. Lewis C. Lawson for the respondents.

No. 799. C. G. Schull, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma, petitioner, vs. New Amsterdam Casualty Company.

No. 800. C. G. Schull, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma, petitioner, vs. Fidelity Casualty Company.

No. 801. C. G. Schull, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma, petitioner, vs. Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.

C. G. Schull, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma,
Petitioner,
802 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.
C. G. Schull, Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma,
Petitioner,
803 vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kirby Fitzpatrick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude Nowlin, Mr. J. R. Spielman, Mr. James S. Ross, Mr. Stephen Chandler, Mr. Jos. A. McCullough, and Mr. C. B. Ames for the respondents.

George Lee Johnston,
Petitioner,
804 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. G. McLaren for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
805 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. R. Wright for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. John T. Fowler, Jr., for the respondent.

Thomas W. Miller,
Petitioner,
808 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert J. Johnstone and Mr. Samuel Seabury for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:.

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Edward Gluck, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Dinsmore, It is ordered that Edward H. Green, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Ottenberg, It is ordered that Sigmund Metz, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Wyatt, It is ordered that Sigurd Ueland, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl F. Shuler, It is ordered that Joseph L. Stern and Leo Weil, Esquires, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Stanley Hendricks, It is ordered that Louis Kawin, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that John J. O'Toole, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, and Arthur E. Moreton, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Robert J. Woodruff, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, It is ordered that Matthew H. Kenealy, Esquire, of Stamford State of Connecticut, and Jackson Palmer Esquire, of Lowell, , State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that J. Marion Wright, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that Frederic P. Lee, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Hubert Work, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
344 vs.
Robert L. Braffet, Administrator of the Estate of Mark P. Braffet, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
501 vs.
A. G. Risty, Chris Olson, L. E. Larson, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

A. S. J. Shaw, State Auditor,
Substituted for C. C. Childers,
State Auditor of the State of
Oklahoma,
234 vs.
Gibson-Zahniser Oil Corporation et al.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Question 1 must be answered "No", and that Question 2 must be answered "No."

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of United
States Internal Revenue for the
Twenty-third District of
Pennsylvania, Petitioner,
341 vs.
James R. Tindle and the Union Trust
Company of Pittsburgh, Co-executors,
etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

M. O. Danciger and Emmerich Oil Company, Petitioners, vs. N. K. Smith.

224

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

City of New Brunswick, William C. Howell, Treasurer of the City of New Brunswick, and William C. Howell, Tax Collector, etc., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America and United States Housing Corporation.

260

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey with instructions to enter a decree in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of the opinion that the District Court reached the proper conclusion, and that its decree should be affirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 2, Original.—October Term, 1927.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas. } In Equity.

[April 9, 1928.]

Memorandum opinion by Mr. Justice Sanford.

A petition for rehearing has been presented by the State of New Mexico, which we think must be denied. But it points to an error in our opinion announced December 5, 1927, which, while not affecting the ultimate decision, requires correction. The petition invites special attention to some evidence which shows that the statements made in the opinion to the effect that the State of Texas and the United States had prior to 1912 recognized and acquiesced in the line of the Rio Grande River as it was located in 1850, as the boundary between the Territory of New Mexico and Texas, without reference to subsequent changes by accretion, are not accurate, and, with the observations based on them, should be recalled. The order will be that the fifth paragraph of that portion of the opinion under the heading "Accretions" and the first part of the next paragraph down to and including the words "in its own Constitution," be stricken from the opinion, and the following paragraph substituted:

New Mexico, when admitted as a State in 1912, explicitly declared in its Constitution that its boundary ran "along said thirty-second parallel to the Rio Grande . . . as it existed on the ninth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and fifty; thence, *following the main channel of said river, as it existed on the ninth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and fifty*, to the parallel of thirty-one degrees, forty-seven minutes north latitude." This was confirmed by the United States by admitting New Mexico as a State with the line thus described as its boundary; and Texas has also affirmed the same by its pleadings in this cause.

Opinion modified; rehearing denied.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

No. 2, Original.—October Term, 1927.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas.
} In Equity.

[April 9, 1928.]

Announced by Mr. Justice Sanford.

This cause having been heard and submitted upon the pleadings, the report of the special master and the exceptions thereto, and the Court having considered the same and announced its conclusions in an opinion of December 5, 1927, this day modified in certain respects, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed as follows:

1. The exceptions of the State of New Mexico to the master's report are overruled, and the exceptions of the State of Texas are sustained.

2. The bill of the State of New Mexico is dismissed, and the cross-bill of the State of Texas sustained.

3. The true boundary between the State of New Mexico and the State of Texas in the valley of the Rio Grande River, extending southwardly from the parallel of 32 degrees north latitude to the parallel of 31 degrees 47 minutes on the international boundary between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, is the middle of the channel of the Rio Grande River as it existed on the 9th day of September, 1850, as outlined by the special master in Section V(1) of his report; the intersection of the east bank of the river with the line of the 32nd parallel to be taken at a point 600 feet west from the Clark Monument No. 1 as re-established by the Scott-Cockrell Commission, and the middle line of the channel to be taken 150 feet from the east and west banks of the river, respectively, as found by the special master.

4. Samuel S. Gannett, geodetic and astronomic engineer, is designated as commissioner to run, locate and mark the boundary between the two States as determined by this decree. In ascertaining and locating the line of said boundary, the commissioner

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STAT

No. 2, Original.—October Term, 1927.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Texas. } In Equity.

[April 9, 1928.]

Memorandum opinion by Mr. Justice Sanford.

A petition for rehearing has been presented by the State of Mexico, which we think must be denied. But it points to an in our opinion announced December 5, 1927, which, while nc fecting the ultimate decision, requires correction. The pe invites special attention to some evidence which shows tha statements made in the opinion to the effect that the Sta Texas and the United States had prior to 1912 recognized acquiesced in the line of the Rio Grande River as it was locat 1850, as the boundary between the Territory of New Mexic Texas, without reference to subsequent changes by accretion, ar accurate, and, with the observations based on them, should l called. The order will be that the fifth paragraph of that pc of the opinion under the heading "Accretions" and the first of the next paragraph down to and including the words ": own Constitution," be stricken from the opinion, and the fc ing paragraph substituted:

New Mexico, when admitted as a State in 1912, explicitl clared in its Constitution that its boundary ran "along thirty-second parallel to the Rio Grande . . . as it existed o ninth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and thence, *following the main channel of said river, as it exist the ninth day of September, one thousand eight hundred and* to the parallel of thirty-one degrees, forty-seven minutes latitude." This was confirmed by the United States by adm New Mexico as a State with the line thus described as its boun and Texas has also affirmed the same by its pleadings in cause.

Opinion modified; rehearing den

shall use the most accurate method n plicable in that locality; and he shall ascertained, by establishing permanen ably marked and at appropriate distan

5. The commissioner shall include i the monuments so established and c shall file with his report the field note method used by him in ascertaining boundary, and a map showing the marked by him; also ten copies of his

6. Before entering upon his work t and subscribe his oath to perform hi partially. He shall prosecute the wo patch, and shall have authority to emp be needed therein; and he shall inclu of the work done, the time employed an

7. The work of the commissioner sha to the approval of the Court. One copy report and map shall be promptly tran Governors of the two States; and exc commissioner's report, if there be such Court, or, if it be not in session, filed days after the report is filed.

8. If, for any reason, there occurs a when the Court is not in session, the designation of a new commissioner by t

9. All the costs of the cause not here the compensation and expenses of the c in equal parts by the two States.

A true copy.

Test:

Clerk

Texas.

w known to science and ap-
mark the boundary, as thus
t monuments thereon, suit-

his report a description of
f their locations. And he
s of his survey, showing the
nd locating the line of the
boundary line as run and
report and map.
he commissioner shall take
s duties faithfully and im-
rk with diligence and dis-
ploy such assistants as may
le in his report a statement
d the expenses incurred.
ll be subject in all its parts
each of the commissioner's
mitted by the clerk to the
ptions or objections to the
, shall be presented to the
ith the clerk, within forty

vacancy in the commission
same may be filled by the
he Chief Justice.
tofore adjudged, including
ommissioner, shall be borne

Supreme Court, U. S.

John P. Donnelley,
110 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Sanford.

Black and White Taxicab and Transfer Company, Petitioner,
174 vs.
Brown and Yellow Taxicab and Tranfer Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Howard Moore,
Petitioner,
384 vs.
City of Nampa.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

John A. Grosfield and Richard Caplis,
62 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Montana National Bank of Billings, Plaintiff in error, vs. Yellowstone County of the State of Montana and Henry S. Mutt, as County Treasurer, etc. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

207

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause, be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Arthur H. Lamborn, Gerard P. Tamelin, Charles C. Rigge, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. The National Bank of Commerce of Norfolk, Virginia. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

163

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Stone, Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Sutherland, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner,
231 vs.
Northside Belt Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Midland Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner,
375 vs.
Thomas Barkley, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Augustine L. Humes and Illinois Merchants Trust Company, as Executors, etc., Petitioners,
376 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Fannie E. Untermyer, as Executrix, and Edward D. Untermyer, as Executor, of the Last Will and Testament of Isaac Untermyer, deceased, Petitioners,-
221 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States of America for the Third District of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Sanford
Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Henry Wilson, F. A. Wilson, W. T. Wilson, et al., Petitioners, vs. Pacific Mail Steamship Company, Steamship "Newport," Her Engines, etc.; J. McKinnon, Master, etc. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

146

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California affirmed.

And it is further ordered, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company, Claimant of the Steamship "Newport," her engines, etc., and J. McKinnon, Master of said Vessel, Petitioners, vs. Henry Wilson, F. A. Wilson, W. T. Wilson, et al. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

173

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, so far as it is against the petitioners; and that this cause be, and the same is

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
vs.
Amalia Manzi.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

204

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds,

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Sanford.

Alaska Packers Association,
Petitioner,
vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and John Peterson.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

266

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Jay A. Larkin,

Plaintiff in error,

137 vs.

E. H. Paugh and Lincoln Safe Deposit Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Thomas J. Casey,

Petitioner,

500 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, upon the first count, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, 98 vs. K. S. Leitch.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Frank Nigro, 600 vs. The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Question 1 must be answered in the negative, and that Question 2 must be answered in the affirmative. Questions 3 and 4 are not answered.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds, concurred in by Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Butler, concurred in by Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Corona Cord Tire Company,
Petitioner,
182 vs.
Dovan Chemical Corporation.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kraus Brothers Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
342 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc.; Mobile & Ohio Railroad Company and Alabama Great Southern Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Hampton, Jr. & Company,
Petitioner,
242 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Customs Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission
and Fort Smith, Subiaco & Rock
Island Railroad Company,
Appellants,
607 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

It is ordered that this case be restored to the docket for reargument and assigned for Monday, April 23 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Williamsport Wire Rope Company,
Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

Upon consideration of the motion of the petitioner to reverse and remand herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. The case is assigned for argument on Monday, April 23 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

No. 407. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. Alice M. Ramsey, C. L. King, et al.;

No. 408. C. L. Harris, as Executor of the last will and testament of T. A. Kramer, deceased, plaintiff in error, v. Alice M. Ramsey, C. L. King, et al.;

No. 409. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. W. O. James, C. L. King, et al.;

No. 410. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. W. O. James, C. L. King, et al.;

No. 411. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. Ramsey Petroleum Company, C. L. King, et al.;

No. 412. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. Ramsey Petroleum Company, et al.;

No. 413. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. G. L. Ramsey, C. L. King, et al.;

No. 414. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. C. L. King, et al.;

No. 415. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. M. R. Chastain, C. L. King, et al.;

No. 416. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. M. R. Chastain, C. L. King, et al.;

No. 417. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. A. L. Lloyd, C. L.King, et al.; and

C. L. Harris, as executor etc., plaintiff in error, vs. A. L. Lloyd, C. L. King, et al.

418

Upon consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in these causes, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the cases on the merits. The causes are assigned for argument on Monday, April 23 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 1. Rhederei M. Jebsen Company, appellant, v. The United States;

No. 2. The Firm of M. Jebsen, etc., appellant, v. The United States;

No. 3. Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Company, appellant, v. The United States.

No. 4. Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Company, appellant, v. The United States.

No. 5. Atlas Line Steamship Company, appellant, v. The United States;

No. 6. Atlas Line Steamship Company, appellant, v. The United States;

No. 7. North German Lloyd, appellant, v. The United States;

No. 8. North German Lloyd, appellant, v. The United States;

No. 9. North German Lloyd, appellant, v. The United States;

No. 10. Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft, appellant, v. The United States.

No. 11. Hamburg -Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft, appellant, v. The United States; and

Deutsch-Australische Dampfschiffs-Gesellschaft, Appellant,
12 vs.
The United States.

It is ordered that these cases be and they are hereby reassigned for argument on Monday, April 23 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Wysong,
Plaintiff in error,
977 vs.
The People of the State of California.

In error to the District Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District, State of California,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
700 vs.
The Cambridge Loan and Building Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
770 vs.
Morgan L. Davis, as Administrator of the Estate of W. Baylor Richards, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Pipe Line Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
319 vs.
Commissioners of Index Sulphur Drainage District.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rocco DeBellis,
Petitioner,
682 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition, be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna Louise Nolde,
Petitioner,
739 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stuyvesant Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
773 vs.
Jacksonville Oil Mill.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Globe and Rutgers Fire Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
774 vs.
Jacksonville Oil Mill.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Thomas Gillespie and Samuel Hassard Gillespie, carrying on business under the firm name and style of L. C. Gillespie & Sons,
Petitioners,
776 vs.
Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
Louis Ilfeld Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oliver Chapman, as License Collector of the City of St. Louis,
Petitioner,
784 vs.
International Shoe Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Armour and Company,
Petitioner,
785 vs.
Bassel Brothers, a copartnership composed of Neal Bassel, A. J. Bassel, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Armour & Company,
Petitioner,
786 vs.
The Belton National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Hardie,
Petitioner,
787 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jesse McGee, Sallie McGee, Elias Wesley, et al., Petitioners,
790 vs.
W. A. Ledbetter, C. V. Pardue, W. A. Watson, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guiseppe Yaconi,
Petitioner,
792 vs.
Brady & Cice, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Katie Roubedeaux and Lizzie Gibbs, nee' Brink, heirs at law, W. W. Brown, et al.,
Petitioners,
793 vs.
Quaker Oil & Gas Company of Oklahoma, Southwestern Petroleum Company, The Pure Oil Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. G. Schull, Bank Commissioner
of the State of Oklahoma,
Petitioner,
799 vs.
New Amsterdam Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. G. Schull, Bank Commissioner
of the State of Oklahoma,
Petitioner,
800 vs.
Fidelity Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. G. Schull, Bank Commissioner
of the State of Oklahoma,
Petitioner,
801 vs.
Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. C. Schull, Bank Commissioner of
the State of Oklahoma,
Petitioner,
802 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. C. Schull, Bank Commissioner of
the State of Oklahoma,
Petitioner,
803 vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Lee Johnston,
Petitioner,
804 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
805 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas W. Miller,
Petitioner,
808 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
17, Original.
The State of Utah.

Upon consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, May 7 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Wysong,
Plaintiff in error,
877 vs.
The People of the State of California.

Upon consideration of the writ of error heretofore allowed in this cause, and treating said writ as a petition for writ of certiorari under section 237 (c) of the Judicial Code, as amended by the act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 936, 938); It is now here ordered by this Court that Joe Wysong do show cause before this Court on April 30, 1928, if any cause there be, by printed return and printed brief, why the petition for writ of certiorari herein should not be denied for lack of a substantial federal question shown in the record giving this Court jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Reed, et al.,
Petitioners,
744 vs.
The County Commissioners of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. King for the petitioners.

Fajardo Sugar Company of Porto Rico, Petitioner,
843 vs.
Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer.
Fajardo Sugar Company of Porto Rico, Petitioner,
844 vs.
Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer.

Upon consideration of the motion for leave to postpone the submission of the petitions for writs of certiorari herein until Monday, May 7 next, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and leave is granted respondent to file briefs on or before that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., Luckenbach Company, Inc., and Edgar F. Luckenbach, Petitioners,
758 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King, Mr. William B. King, and Mr. George R. Shields for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Ocean Steamship Company of Savannah, Petitioner,
759 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr., Mr. William B. King, and Mr. George A. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Chevrolet Motor Company, Petitioner,
781 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. John Thomas Smith, and Mr. Frank A. Gaynor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Unadilla Valley Railway Company, Petitioner,
789 vs.
Ernest Caldine, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits of Harold E. Caldine, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, Mr. Arthur P. Drury, and Mr. Wirt Howe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas B. Kattell for the respondent.

The State of Connecticut,
Plaintiff,
___, Original.
State of North Carolina.

The motion for leave to file the declaration in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the plaintiff.

Ex Parte:
In the Matter of Thomas E. Williams, Tax Commissioner,
16 Original Petitioner.

The return of the Honorable Joseph W. Woodrough, United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska, to the rule to show cause, herein, was presented.

Ray R. Hawthorne,
Plaintiff in error,
866 vs.
Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Murphy for the plaintiff in error.

The United States,
Petitioner,
753 vs.
George Nichols and Mary B. Nichols, as Executors of the Estate of John W. T. Nichols, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. T. H. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry A. Stickney for the respondents.

Francis L. Kohlman, Trustee of the Estate of The Fleischmann Construction Company, a Bankrupt Corporation, Petitioner,
757 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi H. David, Mr. Harold J. Pack, Mr. Wm. P. Kimber, and Mr. David W. Kahn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the

Oxford Oil Company and J. G. Bass, Petitioners,
791 vs.
Atlantic Oil Producing Company, C. E. Gilmore, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. L. Bass and Mr. R. H. Ward for the petitioners, and by Mr. John L. Young for the respondents.

Bertha Canavan, Petitioner,
794 vs.
Peter Kitchen and E. W. Dobson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam G. Bratton for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. W. Dobson for the respondents.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Petitioner,
795 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Haight, Mr. Harold S. Deming, and Mr. George A. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Local Union NO.—, Wm. Fuhrwerk, et al., Petitioners,
811 vs.
Curlee Clothing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Luther Ely Smith and Mr. Elmer E. Pearey for the petitioners, and by Mr. George M. Magee for the respondent.

William Driscoll and Thomas Driscoll, Petitioners,
812 vs.
The State Board of Land Commissioners of the State of Colorado, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin H. Park for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wm. L. Boatright, Mr. Charles Roach, Mr. Edw. M. Freeman, and Mr. Paul P. Prosser for the respondents.

Cudahy Packing Company, Petitioner,
814 vs.
Munson Steamship Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gilbert H. Montague for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cletus Keating for the respondent.

Mrs. Alma Alman, as Executrix of the Estate of Sam Alman, deceased, Petitioner,
816 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry H. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. M. Stevens for the respondent.

Calvin R. Morgan, Petitioner,
817 vs.
Riverside Mills Company, C. A. Folk, T. I. Ward, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James S. Pilcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. K. T. McConnico for the respondents.

Erie Railroad Company, and
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioners,
818 vs.
Hoyland Flour Mills Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Kansas City, State of Kansas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mitchell D. Follansbee, Mr. Leslie A. Welch, Mr. Thomas Mackney, Mr. Cyrus Crane, and Mr. Clyde E. Shorey for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. R. Morrison for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
819 vs.
Mrs. Susie G. Marshall, Widow of
Frank A. Marshall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. B. Montgomery, and Mr. Louis H. Cooke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry P. Sneed for the respondent.

J. A. Dillard and W. P. Fullingim,
individually, etc.,
Petitioners,
820 vs.
Hal Brown & Company, Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam C. Bratton for the petitioners.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
821 vs.
Lillian Oglesby, Administratrix of the Estate of Ernest E. Oglesby, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward T. Miller and Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mont T. Prewitt for the respondent.

Edward Roos, Petitioner,
829 vs.
The Texas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Basil O'Connor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry T. Klein for the respondent.

Walter L. Price, Petitioner,
832 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. McCarron for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd, and Mr. Percy M. Cox for the respondent.

J. Robert Cogen, Petitioner,
833 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sanford H. Cohen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

General Investment Company,
Petitioner,
834 vs.
The New York Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. H. West for the respondent.

W. A. Roth,
Petitioner,
835 vs.
David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin A. Meserve for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Brice Toole, for the respondent.

Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois,
Petitioner,
836 vs.
The Northern Trust Company, as Executor under the last will and testament of A. C. Bartlett, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. T. H. Lewis for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. F. Dammann, Jr. for the respondent.

Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company,

Petitioner,

837 vs.

Louis Hubshman, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Archibald Palmer and Mr. Max L. Rosenstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Lion Cohen for the respondent.

Harry Oriel and Joseph Confino, individually and as members of the firm of Oriel, Confino & Co.,

Petitioners,

838 vs.

William E. Russell, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Oriel, Confino & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugo Levy for the petitioners, and by Mr. William E. Russell for the respondent.

Walter Wyatt, William A. Horn, Joseph Mochnaly, et al.,

Petitioners,

839 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. McGinnis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Louise Foster, for the respondent.

Jack Hood, John Hood, Ben Bowdry, et al., Petitioners,
840 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren K. Snyder for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
842 vs.
J. E. Johnson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Steiner, Mr. Benjamin P. Crum, and Mr. Leon Weil for the petitioner, and by Mr. William W. Hill and Mr. Richard T. Rives for the respondent.

J. G. (Guy) Hooker, Petitioner,
845 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Sorrells for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

M. H. Gordon, Petitioner,
847 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. H. Gordon, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Insurance Company of North America, Petitioner,
848 vs.
Steamtug "Bathgate" her engines, etc., Southern Transportation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis S. Laws, Mr. John M. Woolsey, and Mr. Robert S. Erskine, for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Thruston Manning, Jr., and Mr. Everett H. Brown, Jr. for the respondent.

The New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner,
851 vs.
Edgar M. Granfell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Judicial District, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. T. Kinder, for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. B. Newcomb, for the respondent.

The State Highway Commission of Wyoming, consisting of Hyram Lingle, T. D. O'Neil, et al., Petitioners,
852 vs.
Utah Construction Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William O. Wilson, for the petitioners, and by Mr. John W. Lacey and Mr. Herbert Lacey, for the respondent.

Jerry R. McCoy,

Petitioner,

403 vs.

A. S. J. Shaw, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma and the Pure Oil Company.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin Dabney and Mr. V. P. Crowe, for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T.Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Thomas Taylor, It is ordered that Henri L. Warren, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that Augustine L. Beason, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz G. Lanham, It is ordered that Hollis M. Kimrd, Esquire, of Orange, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Eugene Mills Meacham, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Ewing Dean Colvin, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Joseph A. Finney and Frank L. Johnson, Esquires, of Xenia, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley, It is ordered that David A. Buckley, Jr., of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. August H. Andresen, It is ordered that Joseph F. O'Brien, Esquire, of Stillwater, State of Minnesota, , be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Meeers, It is ordered that Attilio di Girolamo, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Sherriff, It is ordered that W. Cameron Burton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Cann, It is ordered that Howard L. Townsend, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, and George M. Elliott, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Gregory Hankin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Walton Moore, It is ordered that Robert Augustus . . McIntyre, Esquire, of Warrenton, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Milton E. Springer et al.,
Petitioners,
564 vs.
Government of the Philippine Islands.
Gregoria Agoncillo et al.,
Petitioners,
573 vs.
Government of the Philippine Islands.

These cases were argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Plaintiff in error,
723 vs.
Jacob A. Goldman, Louis J. Desmare, Clem Miner, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Robert R. Nevin for the defendants in error.

Gertrude Davis,
Plaintiff in error,
748 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Joseph L. Stern for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

M. J. Dugan,

Plaintiff in error,

766 vs.

The State of Ohio.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. F. L. Johnson for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. Joseph A. Finney for the defendant in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Lucy B. Brooke,

Petitioner,

229 vs.

City of Norfolk et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert B. Tunstall for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. E. Warren Wall for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Marion Wright, It is ordered that Will G. Fields, Esquire, of San Dimas, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Martin, It is ordered that Alex. F. Weisberg, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, It is ordered that David A. Orebaugh, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Barse, It is ordered that John F. D. Meighen, Esquire, of Albert Lea, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal H. Weller, It is ordered that Maurice Bloch, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Daniel Kelleher, [illegible],
Appellant,
687 vs.
C. T. French.

This case was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Lucy B. Brooke,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
City of Norfolk et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. E. Warren Wall for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Robert B. Tunstall for the petitioner.

International Shoe Company,
Plaintiff in error,
401 vs.
L. Pinkus, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. J. D. Williamson for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. Lamar Williamson for the defendants in error.

Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Company, et al.,
Appellants,
404 vs.
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Morison R. Waite for the appellants, continued by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, and Mr. J. Stanley Payne for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. M. G. Roberts for the West Side Lines.

Edward E. Jenkins, as Receiver, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
424 vs.
National Surety Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Paul H. Ray for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Margaret T. Lynch, it is ordered that Helen I. Williams, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elwood H. Seal, It is ordered that Otto C. Hauschild, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dwight B. Galt, It is ordered that . . Clifford P. Dunn, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Harry A. Campbell, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, It is ordered that Leroy A. Lincoln, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dwight B. Galt, It is ordered that Charles J. Staples, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles G. Edwards, It is ordered that J. Z. Foster, Esquire, of Marietta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that William E. Price, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

City of New Brunswick et al.,
Petitioners,
260 vs.
United States of America and U. S. Housing Corporation.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, the mandate was granted in this case.

National Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
228 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, leave was granted to file brief of The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company, and The Prudential Insurance Company, as amici curiae, in this case.

Edward E. Jenkins, as Receiver, etc., et al., Petitioners,
424 vs.
National Surety Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John Jensen for the petitioners, by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. John Jensen for the petitioners.

National Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
228 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt and Mr. J. Harry Covington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Midland National Bank of Minneapolis, Petitioner,
425 vs.
Dakota Life Insurance Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Sigurd Ueland for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Barry, It is ordered that Paul C. Williams, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I Long, It is ordered that L. G. Owen, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, and Samuel W. McIntosh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mark W. Maclay, It is ordered that Harry Martin Zuckert, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frderick W. Dallinger, It is ordered that J. Edward Nally and Peter J. Nelligan, Esquires, of Cambridge, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Maurice E. Rosen, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Pacific Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
472 vs.
Hildur Haglund, as Administratrix.
Southern Pacific Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
473 vs.
Moore Shipbuilding Company, etc., et al.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Denman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ira S. Lillick and Mr. J. F. Sullivan for the respondents, with leave to counsel to file briefs within two weeks, on motion of Mr. Charles H. Bates in that behalf.

Midland National Bank of Minneapolis, Petitioners,
425 vs.
Dakota Life Insurance Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Sigurd Ueland for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. John B. Hanten for the respondent.

City of Gainesville, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Brown-Crummer Investment Company, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. W. O. Davis for the petitioner, by Mr. H. O. Head for H. O. Head, executor, and by Mr. Alex. P. Weisberg for Brown-Crummer Investment Company.

Frank C. Jordan, Secretary of State, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
449 vs.
K. Tashiro, M.D., Isami Sekiyama, M.D., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. U. S. Webb for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument. Leave was granted counsel to file briefs within two weeks on the question whether a writ of certiorari shall be granted, the case to be thereafter set down for hearing on that question alone.

White River Gardens, Inc., S. Katsuno, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
455 vs.
State of Washington, Taka Hirabayashi, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frederic E. Fuller for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wood, It is ordered that John G. McKay, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. H. Watkins, It is ordered that W. L. Guice, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Irwin, It is ordered that Peyton R. Sandoz, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiam, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. M. Holcombe, It is ordered that Edward H. Palmer, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and Robert Whipple Wilson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert G. Redpath, It is ordered that Asa Matlack Stackhouse, Esquire, of Moorestown, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Bayard, It is ordered that James Saulsbury, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, It is ordered that Walter W. McCaslin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Harry R. Stocker, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Francis L. Driscoll, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Lionel Isaacs, Esquire, of Union City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Graciano T. Natividad, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mrs. L. E. Williams, individually and Natural Tutrix of Her Minor, Son, John Earl Williams,

Petitioner,

252 vs.

Great Southern Lumber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut, Petitioner, vs. Arthur Silberman, Charles Moebius, Joseph Plaut, et al., executors. 190

On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Fairfield County, State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of Fairfield County, State of Connecticut and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part and reversed in part, with costs, against the respondents; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Superior Court of Fairfield County, State of Connecticut for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Silbermann, Charles Moebius, Joseph Plaut, et al., executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. William H. Blodgett, Tax Commissioner of the State of Connecticut. 191

In error to the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs against the plaintiffs in error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Reed, Charles L. McNary, William H. King, et al., etc., Petitioners,
744 vs.
The County Commissioners of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, The Prothonotary of Delaware County and John J. Sailing, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 23 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Saltis, Appellant,
912 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

It is ordered that this criminal case upon the docket be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 23 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Talbert W. Hughes, Plaintiff in error,
910 vs.
The State Board of Medical Examiners.
Nathan A. Hughes, Plaintiff in error,
911 vs.
The State Board of Medical Examiners.

It is ordered that these cases be, and they are hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Ray R. Hawthorne,
Plaintiff in error,
866 vs.
Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Ray R. Hawthorne,
Plaintiff in error,
866 vs.
Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company.

In error to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gertrude Davis,
Plaintiff in error,
748 vs.
The State of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Unadilla Valley Railway Company,
Petitioner,
789 vs.
Ernest Caldine, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Harold E. Caldine, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
753 vs.
George Nichols and Mary B. Nichols, as Executors of the Estate of John W. T. Nichols, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Francis L. Kohlman, Trustee of the Estate of the Fleischmann Construction Company, a Bankrupt Corporation, Petitioner,
757 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luckenbach Steamship Company,
Inc., Luckenbach Company, Inc.,
and Edgar F. Luckenbach,
Petitioners,
758 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ocean Steamship Company of
Savannah, Petitioner,
759 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chevrolet Motor Company,
Petitioner,
781 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oxford Oil Company and J. G. Bass, Petitioners,
791 vs.
Atlantic Oil Producing Company, C. E. Gilmore, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bertha Canavan, Petitioner,
794 vs.
Peter Kitchen and E. W. Dobson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Petitioner,
798 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers
of America Local Union No.---,
Wm. Fuhrwerk, et al.,
Petitioners,
811 vs.
Curlee Clothing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Driscoll and Thomas
Driscoll, Petitioners,
812 vs.
The State Board of Land Commissioners of the State of Colorado and
the Texas Production Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cudahy Packing Company,
Petitioner,
814 vs.
Munson Steamship Line.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Alma Alman, as Executrix of the Estate of Sam Alman, deceased,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Calvin R. Morgan,
Petitioner,
817 vs.
Riverside Mills Company, C. A. Folk, T. I. Ward, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Railroad Company and
Missouri Pacific Railroad
Company, Petitioners,
818 vs.
Hoyland Flour Mills Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Kansas City, State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Kansas City, State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
819 vs.
Mrs. Susie G. Marshall, Widow of
Frank A. Marshall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereuponnhad,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. A. Dillard and W. P. Fullingim, individually, etc., Petitioners, vs. Hal Brown & Company, Incorporated.

820 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Lillian Oglesby, Administratrix of the Estate of Ernest E. Oglesby, deceased.

821 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward Roos, Petitioner, vs. The Texas Company.

829 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter L. Price,

Petitioner,

832 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court that the salary of the Marshal of this Court be, and the same is hereby, fixed at the sum of $5,500 per annum; and that the salaries of the assistants to the Marshal be fixed as follows:

Assistant,	$4,500
Librarian,	4,200
Crier,	3,600
Attendant in Court Room,	2,030

Effective as of the date hereof.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Connecticut,

Plaintiff,

——, Original. vs.

The State of North Carolina.

The motion for leave to file opposition to the motion for leave to file declaration was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dennis C. Brummitt for the defendant.

The State of Connecticut,

Plaintiff,

——, Original. vs.

The State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the motion to amend the motion for leave to file and to amend the declaration in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Cape May,
Petitioner,
828 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this case to the Court of Claims with directions to make additional findings of fact was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmond C. Fletcher for the petitioner.

L. P. Larson, Jr., Company,
Petitioner,
603 vs.
Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Company.

The motion for leave to file printed suggestions and motion to amend the order of December 5, 1927, to extend the scope of the argument was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund D. Adcock in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Aldrich, Mr. George I. Haight, Mr. Charles R. Aldrich, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of Mr. Isaac H. Mayer, and Mr. Wallace R. Lane for the respondent, in opposition to this motion with motion to strike petitioner's suggestions and motion from the files.

Samuel B. Ricketts,
Plaintiff in error,
696 vs.
Victoria Shields Allen.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Leonidas B. McIlhenny for the plaintiff in error, leave was granted to file a brief on behalf of the plaintiff in error, on or before Friday next, in opposition to the motion to dismiss.

Wallace C. Gaines,
Petitioner,
841 vs.
The State of Washington.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Ewing D. Colvin for the respondent, leave was granted to file a brief in opposition to the application for writ of certiorari in this case.

E. M. Jones Burget,
Plaintiff in error,
161 vs.
The Borough of Dormont, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

The motion to reinstate this case to the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. E. M. Jones Burget, pro se.

The United States,
Petitioner,
807 vs.
Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank E. Scott for the respondents.

City of Cape May,
Petitioner,
828 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court, by Mr. Edmund C. Fletcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Herman Fox, doing business under the firm name and style of H. Fox & Company, Petitioner,
849 vs.
Chester P. Mills, Federal Prohibition Administrator etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis Landes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Nonda Caranica,
Petitioner,
850 vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. B. Pettus and Mr. James D. Meredith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Cuetara Hermanos, Eudosio Miguel, et al., Petitioners,
856 vs.
Royal Exchange Assurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Walker Taylor for the petitioners, and by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the respondent.

James A. Murphy,
Petitioner,
857 vs.
American Railway Express Company, R. E. M. Cowie, and F. J. Hickey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Hart Anderson, Mr. W. H. Marx, and Mr. A. M. Hartung for the respondents.

Atlas Line Steamship Company,
Appellant,
6 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North German Lloyd,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

7 vs.

The United States.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North German Lloyd,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

8 vs.

The United States.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North German Lloyd,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

9 vs.

The United States.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft (Also known as Hamburg American Line),

Appellant,

10 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hamburg-Amerikanische Paketfahrt Aktien-Gesellschaft (also known as Hamburg American Line),

Appellant,

11 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Deutsch-Australische Dampfschiffs Gesellschaft, Appellant, vs. The United States. 12

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ray R. Hawthorne, Petitioner, vs. Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company. 866

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel B. Ricketts, Plaintiff in error, vs. Victoria Shields Allen. 696

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. McL. Marshall and Mr. Byron B. Harlan for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Leonidas B. McIlhenny for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

White River Gardens, Inc.,
S. Katsuno and Wayo Katsuno, etc.,
et al., Plaintiffs in error,
455 vs.
The State of Washington., Taka
Hirabayashi, and Jane Doe Hirabayashi,
etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Frederic E. Fuller for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Republic of France, Compagnie
Franco-Indo-Chinoise and Engineering
Timber Company, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
459 vs.
French Overseas Corporation, as
owner of the schooner Malcolm
Baxter, Jr.

This case was argued by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the petitioners, and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the respondent.

Montgomery Ward and Company a
corporation, Appellant,
463 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary of
State of the State of Illinois, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Paul O'Donnell for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Spencer Gordon, It is ordered that W. B. McCord, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Winship Wheatley, It is ordered that Frederick W. Sparks, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Hannigan, It is ordered that Judson Hannigan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl H. Jaynes, It is ordered that Thomas F. Veach, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, It is ordered that Samuel W. Mendum, Esquire, of Woburn, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Carl D. Shoemaker, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Burton Coal Company, et al.,
Appellants,
——. vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.

The motion for stay of injunction pending appeal was argued by Mr. Ernest S. Ballard for the appellants; by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for New York Central Railroad Company, Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.; and by Mr. J. V. Norman for the appellees.

Burton Coal Company et al.,
Appellants,
——. vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.

Upon consideration of the motion for stay of injunction pending the appeal in this cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Montgomery Ward and Company, a corporation, Appellant,
463 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary of State, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Paul O'Donnell for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. B. L. Catron for the appellee.

Victor Chemical Works, a corporation, Appellant,
464 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary of State, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Fletcher Lewis for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Coffin Bros. & Company et al., Plaintiffs in error,
465 vs.
T. R. Bennett, Superintendent of Banks, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Orville A. Park for the defendant in error, and submitted by Mr. C. C. Harell and Mr. R. S. Wimberly for the plaintiffs in error.

Mabel C. Reinecke, collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
471 vs.
Frank G. Gardner, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for Reinecke, Collector, and continued by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins for Gardner, Trustee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Irwin, It is ordered that Leander H. Perez, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Dennis, It is ordered that John M. McFaddin, Esquire, of Rockville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Richard J. Finn, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter L. Fisher, It is ordered that William W. Case and William C. Boyden, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Q. Tilson, It is ordered that Edward Gorbield Burke, Esquire, of Deep River, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mabel G. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
471 vs.
Frank C. Gardner, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins for Gardner, Trustee.

Foster-Fountain Packing Company, Inc., and Sea Food Company, Appellants,
768 vs.
E. J. Haydel, Fred Schouest, L. R. Cabriac, et al.
L. O. Johnson, Jr., and Sea Food Company, et al., Appellants,
769 vs.
E. J. Haydel, Fred Schouest, L. R. Cabriac, et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. William H. Watkins and Mr. W. Lee Guice for the appellants, and by Mr. M. M. Irwin and Mr. John Dymond, Jr., for the appellees.

Carter Oil Company et al., Appellants,
496 vs.
Taylor Eli, James Eli, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George S. Ramsey for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Chester I. Long for the appellants, and by Mr. D. H. Linebaugh for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, It is ordered that Vivian L. Page and Ivor A. Page, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that Charles M. Grossman, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George I. Haight, It is ordered that Irvin H. Pathchild, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that W. E. Evans, Esquire, of Glendale, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. J. Montague, It is ordered that Ernest L. Beale, Esquire, of Franklin, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alford E. Clark, It is ordered that Isaac Homer Van Winkle, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ellsworth C. Alvord, It is ordered that G. W. Nix, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer H. Cooper, It is ordered that Watson Washburn, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Carter Oil Company et al.,
Petitioners,
496 vs.
Taylor Eli, James Eli, et al.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. D. H. Linebaugh for the respondents.

Saul M. Nectow,
Plaintiff in error,
509 vs.
City of Cambridge and Inspector of Buildings, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Judson Hannigan and Mr. John E. Hannigan for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Peter J. Nelligan for the defendants in error.

No. 510. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, v. Firemans's Fund Insurance Co.;

No. 511. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S.A., petitioner, v. Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Co.;

No. 512. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A. , petitioner, v. Northwestern Fire & Marine Insurance Co.;

No. 513. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, v. Hartford Fire Insurance Co.;

No. 514. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, v. National Liberty Insurance Co.;

No. 515. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, v. Aetna Insurance Co.;

No. 516. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, v. Western Assurance Co.;

No. 517. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, v. Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Co., Ltd.;

No. 518. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, v. Springfield Fire & Marine Insurance Co.;

No. 519. Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., petitioner, v. Franklin Fire Insurance Co.;

Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A.,
Petitioner,
520 vs.
Pheonix Insurance Co.

These cases were argued by Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the respondents.

Karl Buzynski,
Petitioner,
534 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc.,
et al.

This case was argued by Mr. W. E. Price for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. N. Rayzor for the respondents.

The City of New York,
Plaintiff in error,
552 vs.
Frank Campbell.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Elliot S. Benedict for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Mark Skinner Willing and The Northern Trust Co., as Trustee etc., et al., Petitioners,
561 vs.
Chicago Auditorium Association.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioners.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. — Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert M. Clarke, It is ordered that Earl E. Moss, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George N. Brown, It is ordered that Edward C. Rowe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George N. Brown, It is ordered that John A. Kelly, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Denison, It is ordered that Charles E. Feirich, Esquire, of Cartondale, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Felix C. Davila, It is ordered that Heriberto Torres Sola, Esquire, of Rio Piedras, Porto Rico, [illegible], be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Harry E. Burroughs, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mark Skinner Willing and The Northern Trust Co., as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners,
561 vs.
Chicago Auditorium Association.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioners, by Mr. Walter L. Fisher for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioners.

Standard Pipe Line Company, Petitioner,
577 vs.
Miller County Highway and Bridge District.

This case was argued by Mr. William H. Arnold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the respondent.

Cliffs Chemical Company, Plaintiff in error,
579 vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission.

This case was argued by Mr. William P. Belden for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. John W. Reynolds and Mr. Franklin E. Bump for the defendant in error.

P. J. McGowan & Sons, Inc.,

Appellant,

589 vs.

I. H. Van Winkle, as Attorney General etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. B. McCord for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that Minnie Lackenbach and Arnold C. Lackenbach, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that L. C. Crofton, Esquire, of Titusville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that John E. Patterson, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rush L. Holland, It is ordered that John E. Jackson, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert G. Redpath, It is ordered that George H. Merritt, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Lucy B. Brooke,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
City of Norfolk, R. W. Peatross, A. Plummer Pannill, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

L. P. Larson, Jr., Company,
Petitioner,
603 vs.
Wm. Wrigley Jr. Company.

On consideration of the motion to amend the order granting the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel B. Ricketts,

Plaintiff in error,

696 vs.

Victoria Shields Allen.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that a motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. M. Jones Burget,

Plaintiff in error,

161 vs.

The Borough of Dormont, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Upon consideration of the motion to reinstate this case on the docket, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Shoe Company,

Plaintiff in error,

401 vs.

I. Pinkus, George Franklin, Sam Dessent, et al.

It is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for a reargument and assigned for Monday, October 1 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel B. Ricketts,

Plaintiff in error,

696 vs.

Victoria Shields Allen.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

White River Gardens, Inc., S. Katsuno and Wao Katsuno, etc., et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. The State of Washington, Taka Hirabayashi and Jane Doe Hirabayashi, etc.

455 In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Montgomery Ward and Company, a corporation, Appellant, vs. Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary of State of the State of Illinois, et al.

463 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Victor Chemical Works, a Corporation, Appellant, vs. Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary of State of the State of Illinois, et al.

464 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Carter Oil Company, J. Wood Glass, F. A. Calvert, et al., Petitioners, vs. Taylor Eli, James Eli, Charlotte Chuculate, etc., et al.

496 — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

552 vs. State of New York.

Frank Campbell.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cliffs Chemical Company,

Plaintiffs in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

579 vs. State of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin Tax Commission.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. J. McGovan & Sons, Inc.,

Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the

589 vs. United States for the District of

I. H. Van Winkle, as Attorney General Oregon.

of the State of Oregon, John C.

Veatch, Fred P. Kendall, et al., etc.,

et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

George Tazewell, as Presiding Judge of the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for Multnomah County,

Petitioner,

746 vs.

The State of Oregon ex rel. Edward Sullivan.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the petitioner and respondent in this case do show cause in printed form, if any cause there be, on or before Monday, May 7, 1928, why this case should not be dismissed as moot.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Petitioner,

807 vs.

Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Robert Cogen,

Petitioner,

833 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mabel G. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois,

Petitioner,

836 vs.

The Northern Trust Company, as Executor under the last will and Testament of A. C. Bartlett, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company,

Petitioner,

837 vs.

Louis Hubshman, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Oriel and Joseph Confino, individually and as members of the firm of Oriel, Confino & Co.,

Petitioners,

838 vs.

William F. Russell, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Oriel, Confino & Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
842 vs.
J. E. Johnson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner,
851 vs.
Edgar M. Cranfell.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Judicial District, State of Ohio, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Highway Commission of Wyoming, consisting of Hyram Lingle, T. D. O'Neil, et al., Petitioners,
852 vs.
Utah Construction Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Cape May,

Petitioner,

828 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Investment Company,

Petitioner,

834 vs.

The New York Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Roth,

Petitioner,

835 vs.

David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter Wyatt, William A. Horn,
Joseph Moohnaly, et al.,
Petitioners,
839 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jack Hood, John Hood, Ben Bowdry,
Petitioners,
840 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. G. (Guy) Hooker,
Petitioner,
845 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. H. Gordon, Petitioner,
847 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Insurance Company of North America, Petitioner,
848 vs.
Steamtug "Bathgate" her engines, etc.; Southern Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herman Fox, doing business under the firm name and style of H. Fox & Company, Petitioner,
849 vs.
Chester P. Mills, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., and David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nonda Caranica,

Petitioner,

850 vs.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cuetara Hermanos, Eudosio, Miguel and Manuel de la Cuetara,

Petitioners,

856 vs.

Royal Exchange Assurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Murphy,

Petitioner,

857 vs.

American Railway Express Company,

R. E. M. Cowie and F. J. Hickey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court that the call of the docket be suspended for the term on Friday, April 27 next, and that the Court will take a recess from Monday, April 30, until Monday, May 14, next.

It is further ordered by this Court that no petitions for writs of certiorari or other motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, May 28 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Botany Worsted Mills,

Petitioner,

659 vs.

The United States.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, leave was granted to file a brief of A. C. Lacy, as amicus curiae, in this case.

Joseph Saltis,

Appellant,

912 vs.

The People of the State of Illinois.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court, with leave to counsel for the appellant to file brief within 10 days, and to counsel for the appellee to file a brief within 4 days thereafter, on motion of Mr. Louis J. Greenberg for the appellant.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
342 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General
of Railroads, as Agent, etc., et al.

The motion by the respondents to amend the judgment as to costs and to retax the costs in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex M. Bull for the respondents.

State of Wisconsin, State of
Minnesota, State of Ohio, and State
of Pennsylvania, Complainants,
7, Original vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary Dis-
trict of Chicago.
Defendants,
State of Missouri, State of Kentucky,
State of Tennessee, State of Louisiana,
State of Mississippi, and State of
Arkansas, Intervening Defendants,
State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary
District of Chicago.
State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original vs.
State of Illinois, and Sanitary
District of Chicago.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, leave was granted to file an appendix to defendants' brief.

Rhederei M. Jebsen Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

1 vs.

The United States.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Firm of M. Jebsen, Corresponding Owner of the Steamship Company, Carl Diederichsen for the use of Rhederei M. Jebsen Company,

Appellants, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

2 vs.

The United States.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged, ~~and decreed~~ by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Catalino Figueroa,

Petitioner,

922 vs.

Sixto M. Saldana, Warden.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Catalino Figueroa, pro se.

Botany Worsted Mills, Petitioner,
659 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twenty-third rule, per stipulation of counsel.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
855 vs.
Peter W. Bielmeier and State Industrial Board of the State of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Whalen for the petitioner.

Benjamin F. Falter, Herman H. Canter, et al., Petitioners,
859 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin A. Schenck, Mr. Frederic C. Scofield, Mr. Nash Rockwood, and Mr. Harry S. Bandler for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Edwin G. Davis for the respondent.

The State of Montana, ex rel. Janet T. Ingersoll, Petitioner,
860 vs.
Charles H. Clapp, as president, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. E. Pew for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. A. Foot and Mr. A. H. Angstman for the respondents.

Chicago, Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
863 vs.
Emma J. Crouch, as Special Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Montreville J. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the respondent.

Belle Ayre Conservation Company, Petitioner,
864 vs.
The State of New York.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Sheldon Frost for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert Ottinger for the respondent.

David A. Wright, Administrator of the Estate of Douglas B. Ellis, deceased, Petitioner,
865 vs.
Grand Trunk Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas A. E. Weadock for the petitioner.

Juan Chavez, Petitioner,
868 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Riley R. Cloud for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Midland Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
869 vs.
Robert L. Imler and Ruth E. Imler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. E. Swan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sumners Hardy for the respondents.

C. L. Webster Canning Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
872 vs.
The Hogue-Kellogg Company, Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Heath for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ivor A. and Vivian L. Page Page for the respondent.

The State of Wisconsin, et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Nathan L. Miller for the State of New York; and continued by Mr. William W. Potter for the State of Michigan; by Mr. Wilbur M. Brucker for the State of Michigan; by Mr. Raymond T. Jackson for the State of Wisconsin; and by Mr. Cyrus E. Dietz for the State of Illinois.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Dolan, Jr., It is ordered that Hugh M. McCaffrey, Esquire, of Clarendon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Percy H. Moore, It is ordered that Leo C. Weiler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Green, It is ordered that Montague Young, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Alexander W. Swords, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that J. Paul Stewart, Esquire, of Haworth, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Williamsport Wire Rope Company,
Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Newton K. Fox, leave was granted to file a brief of Adrian C. Humphreys and Newton K. Fox, as amici curiae, in this case.

The State of Wisconsin et al.,
Complainant,
7, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.
State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Cyrus E. Dietz for the State of Illinois; Mr. Daniel N. Kirby for the Mississippi River States; Mr. James Hamilton Lewis for the Sanitary District of Chicago; Mr. James M. Beck for the Sanitary District of Chicago; and concluded by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the complainant in No. 7, Original.

United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission et al., Appellants, vs. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co. 607

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States and continued by Mr. H. H. Larrimore for the appellee. The argument was postponed, and the case assigned for reargument on Monday, October 1 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Williamsport Wire Rope Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 337

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James Walton for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. McGovern, It is ordered that William F. Waugh, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Graupner, It is ordered that W. M. Simmons, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. H. LaGuardia, It is ordered that Milton Eisen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Taft, It is ordered that Clarence Castlmore, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that L. E. Dunham, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry B. Hazard, It is ordered that Grover Cleveland Ladner, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, Complainant,
17, Original.
The State of Utah.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, in behalf of Mr. Harvey H. Cluff, the time within which to file answer of the State of Utah to the bill of complaint was extended to August 7, 1928.

The Williamsport Wire Rope Company, Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. James Walton for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

No. 407. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. Alice M. Ramsey, et al.;

No. 408. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. Alice M. Ramsey et al.;

No. 409. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. W. O. James et al.;

No. 410. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. W. O. James et al.;

No. 411. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. Ramsey Petroleum Company, et al.;

No. 412. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. Ramsey Petroleum Co., et al.;

No. 413. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. G. L. Ramsey, et al.;

No. 414. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. G. L. Ramsey, et al.;

No. 415. H. F. Ferry, plaintiff in error, v. M. R. Chastain, et al.;

No. 416. C. L. Harris, as executor, etc., plaintiff in error, v. M. R. Chatain, et al.;

H. F. Ferry,
Plaintiff in error,
417 vs.
A. L. Lloyd et al.
C. L. Harris, as executor, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
418 vs.
A. L. Lloyd et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. S. M. Brewster for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. K. M. Geddes for the defendants in error.

Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Co., Appellant,
3 vs.
The United States.
Hamburg-American Line Terminal and Navigation Co., Appellant,
4 vs.
The United States
Atlas Line Steamship Company,
Appellant,

These cases were argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. Charles H. LeFevre for the appellants.

James A. Reed, Charles I. McNary, et al., Petitioners, 744 vs. The County Commissioners of Delaware County et al.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, leave was granted Mr. Albert J. Williams to appear pro hac vice, in this case. On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Albert J. Williams, leave was granted the respondents to file a brief within ten days. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Levi Cooke for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Albert J. Williams for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace R. Lane, It is ordered that Herbert C. Mayer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Charles C. Spencer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Hal Lindsey, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Sterling M. Wood, Esquire, of Billings, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward A. Harriman, It is ordered that Ralph R. Lounsbury, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt, It is ordered that John W. Simpson, 2d, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James A. Reed, Charles L. McNary, et al., Petitioners,
744 vs.
The County Commissioners of Delaware County, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. A. J. Williams for the respondents. The case was postponed until Monday next to enable counsel to confer and furnish the Court with certain information necessary to the determination of the question as to whether the cause has not become moot.

Elizabeth C. Taft, Petitioner,
554 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector, etc.
Gilbert C. Greenway, Jr., Petitioner,
575 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector, etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Henry W. Taft for the petitioner in No. 554, continued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for Bowers, Collector, by Mr. Henry W. Taft, for the petitioner, in No. 554, and concluded by Mr. Hiram C. Todd for the petitioner in No. 575.

L. P. Larson, Jr. Company,
Petitioner,
603 vs.
Wm. Wrigley Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles H. Aldrich and Mr. George I. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Isaac H. Mayer for the respondent.

Rupert Ribnik,
Plaintiff in error,
569 vs.
Andrew F. McBride, Commissioner of Labor, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Simpson, 2d for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Beers, It is ordered that Jesse A. Miller, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that James W. Finley, Esquire, of Chanute, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that Lawrence Wiseman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that John M. Lee, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, It is ordered that Harrie B. Chase, Esquire, of Brattleboro, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accoreingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. S. O'Brien, It is ordered that Mayne Hamrick, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that Leon J. Obermeyer, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. O. Hart, It is ordered that George B. Smart, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Connecticut,
Plaintiff,
——, Original. vs.
State of North Carolina.

The amended petition for leave to file the declaration in this case was submitted by Mr. H. T. Kingsbury for the plaintiff.

Southern Pacific Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
472 vs.
Hildur Haglund, administratrix;
Southern Pacific Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
473 vs.
Moore Shipbuilding Company, etc. et al.

On motion made by Mr. Charles H. Bates, to the Court in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, leave was granted to file a reply brief of the petitioners on or before Monday next.

Rupert Ribnik, Plaintiff in error,
569 vs.
Andrew F. McBride, Commissioner of Labor, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Harry R. Coulomb for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt for the plaintiff in error.

Great Northern Railway Company, Appellant,
612 vs.
The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission.

This case was argued by Mr. F. G. Dorety for the appellant, by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States, and by Mr. D. W. Knowlton for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians, Appellants,
596 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas Sterling for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max Rhoads, It is ordered that Harry M. Tonkin, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that John Kocinski, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence Miller, It is ordered that M. Vashti Burr, of Ebensburg, State of Pennsylvania; C. Virginia Diedel, of Washington, District of Columbia; Herbert R. Crousman and Moultrie Hitt, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hal H. Smith, It is ordered that Harold R. Martin, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Walter P. Marcus, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that Furman E. West, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Albert J. Williams, Esquire, of Media, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louisville Gas & Electric Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Appeals of

70 vs. the State of Kentucky.

Clell Coleman, As Auditor of the

State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Sanford, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Coffin Bros. & Co., E. J. Dixon,
R. L. Gillen, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
465 vs.
T. R. Bennett, Superintendent of
Banks for the State of Georgia.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

J. Robert Cogen,
Petitioner,
833 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 1 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

The Court will take a recess from today until Monday, May 14,; from that day until Monday, May 21; from that day until Monday, May 28, and from that day until Monday, June 4, upon which day it will adjourn for the term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: In the Matter of
J. D. Collins, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rice Hooe in behalf of Mr. John W. Ray and Mr. Joseph C. Niles for the petitioner.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

On consideration of the motion to reconsider the motion to tranfer to the Clerk of this Court the fund held in trust by the clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. M. Jones Burget,
Plaintiff in error,
161 vs.
The Borough of Dormont, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the motion to reconsider the motion to reinstate this case to the docket, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. Ruric Todd,
Plaintiff in error,
952 vs.
The State of Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

Mr. Blaine Mallan, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"A. Ruric Todd,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
State of Washington,
Defendant in error.

No. ———.

Certificate in support of motion to Docket and Dismiss.

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) s.s.
County of Thurston)

I, C. S. REINHART, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the plaintiff in error in the above entitled cause was on July 15, 1926, adjudged guilty in the superior court of the State of Washington for Cowlitz county of the crime of malicious prosecution in violation of section 2369, Remington's Compiled Statutes of Washington, 1922; that said judgment of conviction was affirmed by the supreme court of the state of Washington on November 28, 1927 (145 Wash. 647); that rehearing en banc was denied by the said Supreme Court of Washington on January 16, 1928; that said plaintiff in error on February 2, 1928, filed with the Supreme Court of Washington his petition for a writ of error, together with assignments of error and bond; that writ of error was duly allowed by Honorable Kenneth Mackintosh, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Washington, on February 2, 1928, and that citation upon said writ of error was thereupon issued fixing the return date as sixty days from the date of said citation, and that said citation was dated February 2, 1928.

I further certify that no order enlarging the time for return to said writ of error and citation made by any judge or justice of the supreme court of Washington is on file or of record in my office.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said court this 17th day of April, 1928.

(S E A L) /s/ C. S. REINHART,
Clerk.".

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the tenth rule,

AND IT APPEARING TO THE COURT that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

IT IS NOW ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of the State of Washington to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fajardo Sugar Company of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

843

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in the above entitled cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fajardo Sugar Company of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Juan C. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

844

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in the above entitled cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rodman Chemical Company and Hugh Rodman, Petitioners, vs. The United States.

853

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert A. Littleton, and Mr. W. W. Spalding for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Charles F. Kincheloe for the respondent.

Wong Wey ex rel. Wong Cheu Dong Petitioner, vs. John P. Johnson, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

862

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph F. O'Connell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Harry W. Houghton, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

870

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Hazel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Lewis-Hall Iron Works, Petitioner, vs. David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

873

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Hamel and Mr. Richard S. Doyle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Western Grain Company,
Petitioner,
874 vs.
Ralston Purina Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brenton K. Fisk and Mr. J. P. Mudd for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin E. Huffman for the respondent.

Dwight James Baum,
Petitioner,
879 vs.
The First National Company of Sarasota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas McCall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue for the respondent.

Frederick G. Dussoulas, Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of Howard A. Lang, Petitioner,
880 vs.
Howard A. Lang.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hiram B. Calkins for the petitioner.

Rudolph Schreiber,
Petitioner,
881 vs.
The Public National Bank & Trust Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moses Cohen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry B. Singer for the respondent.

Margaret M. O'Leary and Penelope O'Leary, Petitioners,
882 vs.
N. & M. Realty Corporation, Nathan Shapanka, and Minnie Stern.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John deR. Storey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Emory R. Buckner for the respondents.

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company, Petitioner,
883 vs.
A. M. Wilson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Eighth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maury Kemp and Mr. J. H. Tallichet for the petitioner..

Kemsley, Millbourn & Co., Ltd., Petitioner,
886 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Franklin Grady for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

W. D. Mitchell, S. E. Whiting, and J. M. Bruere, Petitioners,
888 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. C. West for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Decorative Stone Company, Petitioner,
890 vs.
Building Trade Council of Westchester County, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt and Mr. Daniel Davenport for the petitioner.

Nils Olsen, Einer Eide, et al., Petitioners,
891 vs.
The Steamer "Thomas Tracy", M.&J. Tracy, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene E. Kelly for the petitioners, and by Mr. C. C. Calhoun and Mr. William J. Martin for the respondents.

Union Ferry Company of New York and Brooklyn, Petitioner,
892 vs.
Sarah Moore, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney and Mr. Pierre M. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. William F. Purdy for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
894 vs.
Florence E. Williams.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Kaufman for the respondent.

Herbert Magen,
Petitioner,
896 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Elder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

James A. Reed, Charles L. McNary, et al.,
Petitioners,
744 vs.
The County Commissioners of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, et al.

Statements of counsel presented by Mr. Levi Cooke for the petitioners, and by Mr. Albert J. Williams for the respondents, and case submitted on its merits and upon the question as to whether or not the case has become moot. The time within which to file brief of the respondents was extended five days to and including May 10, and leave was granted petitioners to file a reply thereto within three days thereafter.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 7, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dozier A. DeVane, It is ordered that Nelson Phillips, Jr., Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Ransom, It is ordered that J. Carroll Edwards, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to theCourt in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, It is ordered that Victor S. Mersch, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Earnest, It is ordered that Joseph Koletsky, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that George A. Gibbs, Esquire, of Pasadena, State of California, and Wilbur S. Pierce, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Harry J. Robinson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Doyle, It is ordered that Cedric F. Johnson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, It is ordered that Edmund S. Whitson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that Thomas Hamilton, Esquire, of Clearwater, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Dennis, It is ordered that Alan Egleston Gray, Esquire, of Grafton, State of North Dakota, and Stanley P. Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Heber H. Rice, Esquire, of Huntington, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Kramer, It is ordered that Wade T. Brown, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Ward, It is ordered that Josiah T. Newcomb, Esquire, of Poughkeepsie, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl W. Kindleberger, It is ordered that Ralph Cerreta, Esquire, of Stapleton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that Charles L. Abernethy, Esquire, of New Bern, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that James J. Meade, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Paul V. Tuttle, Esquire, of Takoma Park, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Gustave A. Iverson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that Nate S. Williamson, Esquire, of Meridian, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry F. Riley, It is ordered that Marvey R. Hawgood, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that William Meyerhoff, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that Jed Johnson, Esquire, of Anadarko, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mabel G. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois,

471 vs.

Frank G. Gardner, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the O'Gara Coal Company.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Question 1 must be answered in the negative. Question 2 is not answered.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Holland Furniture Company, Petitioner, vs. Perkins Glue Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

285

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Edward E. Jenkins, as Receiver of the National City Bank of Salt Lake City, Utah; E. J. Groesbeck, Treasurer of Salt Lake County, Utah, et al., Petitioners, vs. National Surety Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

424

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Karl Buzynski,

Petitioner,

534 vs.

Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., and
The Texas Contracting Company, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America,

Plaintiff in error,

723 vs.

Jacob A. Goldman, Louis J. Desmare,
Clem Miner, et al.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Mr. Justice Stone did not sit in this case.

Federal Intermediate Credit Bank
of Columbia, South Carolina,

Petitioner,

456 vs.

Chas. S. Mitchell, W. E. Richardson,
Truckers Supply Company, and South
Carolina Agricultural Credit Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Panhandle Oil Company,

Plaintiff in error,

288 vs.

The State of Mississippi on Relation
of R. H. Knox, Attorney General.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Saul M. Nectow,

Plaintiff in error,

509 vs.

City of Cambridge and Inspector of Buildings of the City of Cambridge, Jeremiah F. Downey.

In error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Milton E. Springer, Dalmacio Costas, and Anselmo Hilario,

Petitioners,

564 vs.

The Government of the Philippine Islands.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Gregorio Agoncillo, Baldomero Roxas and Catalino Lavadia,

Petitioners,

573 vs.

The Government of the Philippine Islands.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis,

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Otis Sprout,

Plaintiff in error,

208 vs.

City of South Bend, Indiana.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the

612 vs. United States for the District of

The United States of America and Minnesota.

Interstate Commerce Commission.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Hamburg-American Line Terminal

& Navigation Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

3 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Hamburg-American Line Terminal

& Navigation Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

4 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby,

Atlas Line Steamship Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

5 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts.

201 vs.

George I. Rockwood.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Sutherland, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,

Petitioner,

202 vs.

George I. Rockwood.

On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Sutherland, and Mr. Justice Stone.

H. Plamals,

Petitioner,

225 vs.

The Steamship "Pinar Del Rio," Her Engines, Boilers, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

St. Louis & Southwestern Railway Company, Appellant, 263 vs. J. H. Mattin, Tax Collector, Consolidated Road District of the Parish of Bossier, Louisiana. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Standard Pipe Line Company, Incorporated, Petitioner, 577 vs. Miller County Highway & Bridge District. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The John P. King Manufacturing
Company, Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
392 vs. State of Georgia.
The City Council of Augusta and Wm.
B. Bell, Mayor, etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, inthis cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Sultan Railway & Timber Company,
Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the
274 vs. State of Washington.
Department of Labor and Industries
of The State of Washington and
Claire Bowman, as Director of
Labor and Industries.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Holmes.

Eclipse Mill Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

275 vs. State of Washington.

Department of Labor and Industries of The State of Washington and Claire Bowman, as Director of Labor and Industries.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Holmes.

H. F. Ferry,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

407 vs. State of Kansas.

Alice M. Ramsey, C. L. King, and L. D. Hadley.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

C. L. Harris, as Executor of the
Last Will and Testament of T. A.
Kramer, Deceased,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
Alice M. Ramsey, C. L. King, H. F.
Ferry, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

408

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler and Mr. Justice Sanford.

H. F. Ferry,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
W. O. James, C. L. King and L. D.
Hadley.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

409

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler and Mr. Justice Sanford.

C. L. Harris, as Executor of the
last Will and Testament of T. A.
Kramer, Deceased,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
410
W. O. James, C. L. King, H. F. Ferry,
et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler and Mr. Justice Sanford.

H. F. Ferry,
Plaintiff in error,
vs.
411
Ramsey Petroleum Company, C. L. King,
L. D. Hadley, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

C. L. Harris, as Executor of the
Last Will and Testament of T. A.
Kramer, Deceased,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

412 vs. State of Kansas.

Ramsey Petroleum Company, C. L. King,
L. D. Hadley, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

M. P. Ferry,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

413 vs. the State of Kansas.

C. L. Ramsey, C. L. King, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

C. L. Harris, as Executor of the
Last Will and Testament of T. A.
Kramer, Deceased,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

414 vs. State of Kansas.

C. L. Ramsey, C. L. King, H. F.
Ferry, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

H. F. Ferry,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

415 vs. the State of Kansas.

M. R. Chastain, C.L. King, L. D.
Hadley, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

C. L. Harris, as Executor of the
Last Will and Testament of T. A.
Kramer, Deceased,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

416 vs. State of Kansas.

M. R. Chastain, C. L. King, H. F.
Perry, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

H. F. Perry,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

417 vs. State of Kansas.

A. L. Lloyd, C. L. King, and L. D.
Hadley.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

C. L. Harris, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of T. A. Kramer, Deceased,

Plaintiff in error,

418 vs.

A. L. Lloyd, C. L. King, H. F. Perry, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

L. P. Larson, Jr., Company,

Petitioner,

603 vs.

Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, as to the allowance of federal taxes, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

City of Gainesville,

Petitioner,

433 vs.

Brown-Crummer Investment Company, Southern Surety Company, and H. O. Head, Executor of H. W. Head.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. J. Dugan,

Plaintiff in error,

766 vs.

The State of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Fireman's Fund Insurance Company.

510

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Company.

511

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Northwestern Fire & Marine Insurance Company.

512

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Hartford Fire Insurance Company.

513

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, 514 vs. National Liberty Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, 515 vs. Aetna Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Western Assurance Company. 516

On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Company, Ltd. 517

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Springfield Fire & Marine Insurance Company. 518

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Franklin Fire Insurance Company. 519

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Compania de Navegacion, Interior, S. A., Petitioner,
520 vs.
Phoenix Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wallace C. Gaines, Petitioner,
841 vs.
The State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The United States,
Petitioner,
283 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company, E. R. Brown, R. Waverly Smith, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to modify the opinion herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
342 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of the respondents to amend the judgment as to costs in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the costs in this Court be equally divided between the parties.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Catalino Figueroa,
Petitioner,
922 vs.
Sixto M. Saldana, Warden.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Catalino Figueroa,
Petitioner,
922 vs.
Sixto M. Saldana, Warden.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Tazewell, as Presiding Judge of the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for Multnomah County, Petitioner,
746 vs.
The State of Oregon ex rel. Edward Sullivan.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and on the return to the rule to show cause why the case should not be dismissed as moot, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, vacated.

And it is further ordered, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon with directions to dismiss the case without prejudice and without costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Botany Worsted Mills,
Petitioner,
659 vs.
The United States.

It is ordered that this case be restored to the docket and assigned for oral argument on Monday, October 1st next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Saltis,
Appellant,
912 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Wysong,
Petitioner,
877 vs.
The People of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District, State of California, and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District, State of California, the return to the rule to show cause, and the argument of counsel thereupon, had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
894 vs.
Florence E. Williams.

Order Allowing Certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank C. Jordan, Secretary of State and Robert V. Jordan, Deputy Secretary of State,
Petitioners,
449 vs.
K. Tashiro, M.D., Isami Sekiyama, M.D., Paul K. Ito, M.D., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David A. Wright, Administrator of the Estate of Douglas B. Ellis, deceased,
Petitioner,
865 vs.
Grand Trunk Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Peter W. Bielmeier and State Industrial Board of the State of New York. 855

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin F. Falter, Herman H. Canter and Bertrand Weiss, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 859

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Montana, ex rel.
Janet T. Ingersoll,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
Charles H. Clapp, as president of the State University of Missoula, Montana, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Great Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
863 vs.
Emma J. Crouch, as Special Administratrix of the Estate of Harold Nathan Crouch, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Belle Ayre Conservation Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
The State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims of the State of New York.

864

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims of the State of New York and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Juan Chavez,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

868

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Midland Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Robert L. Imler and Ruth E. Imler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

869

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. L. Webster Canning Company,
Incorporated, Petitioner,
872 vs.
The Hogue-Kellogg Company,
Incorporated.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rodman Chemical Company and Hugh Rodman, Petitioner,
853 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wong Wey ex rel. Wong Cheu Dong,
Petitioner,
862 vs.
John P. Johnson, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry W. Houghton,
Petitioner,
870 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lewis-Hall Iron Works,
Petitioner,
873 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Grain Company,
Petitioner,
874 vs.
Ralston Purina Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dwight James Baum,

Petitioner,

879 vs.

The First National Company of Sarasota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick G. Dussoulas, Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of Howard A. Lang,

Petitioner,

880 vs.

Howard A. Lang.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rudolph Schreiber,

Petitioner,

881 vs.

The Public National Bank & Trust Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Margaret N. O'Leary and Penelope O'Leary, Petitioners,
982 vs.
N. & M. Realty Corporation, Nathan Shapanka and Minnie Stern.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company, Petitioner,
883 vs.
A. M. Wilson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, Eighth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Eighth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kemsley, Millbourn & Co., Ltd., Petitioner,
886 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. D. Mitchell, S. E. Whiting and J. M. Bruere, Petitioners,
888 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Decorative Stone Company,
Petitioner,
890 vs.
Building Trade Council of Westchester County, Journeymen Stone Cutters Association of North America, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nils Olsen, Einer Eide, Aksel Lundell, et al., Petitioners,
891 vs.
The Steamer "Thomas Tracy," M. J. Tracy, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Ferry Company of New York and Brooklyn, Petitioner,
892 vs.
Sarah Moore, Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herbert Magen, Petitioner,
896 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Government of the Philippine Islands, on relation of the Attorney General, Petitioner,
813 vs.
El Hogar Filipino.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clyde A. DeWitt and Mr. E. Arthur Perkins for the respondent.

Empire Gas & Fuel Company and Equitable Trust Company, Petitioners,
876 vs.
J. M. Saunders et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David B. Tramell, Mr. J. W. Finley, and Mr. Warren T. Spies for the petitioners.

C. Klengenberg, Petitioner,
878 vs.
H. Liebes & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Hasket Derby and Mr. Ernest Clewe for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. M. Simmons for the respondent.

John D. Jewell, as Residuary Devisee, etc., Petitioner,
885 vs.
Edmund H. Graham, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer, Mr. Walter C. Clephane, and Mr. George C. Gertman for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Offutt, Mr. Henry P. Blair, and Mr. Arthur Hellen for the respondent.

George A. Spirou, Petitioner,
887 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert and Mr. R. M. Yeatman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Elmer D. Means and Cephus W. Scott,
Petitioners,
889 vs.
R. F. Terrell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer D. Means for the petitioners.

New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Company and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioners,
893 vs.
Mrs. Janie D. Snelgrove, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. Albert S. Bozeman, and Mr. Walter J. Suthon, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Marion W. Reiley for the respondent.

Harry B. Rose,
Petitioner,
895 vs.
Washington Times Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George R. Sherriff and Mr. W. Cameron Burton for the petitioner.

Humane Stanchion Works,
Petitioner,
900 vs.
Mitchell Mfg. Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Dennett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur L. Morsell for the respondent.

St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner,
901 vs.
American Food Products Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Roger Englar, Mr. Thos. T. Fauntleroy, Mr. Wade H. Ellis, and Mr. Wm. J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. H. Caraway and Mr. John M. Lee for the respondent.

Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc., Petitioner,
902 vs.
Baro Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Neave, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. Clifford E. Dunn, and Mr. Charles J. Staples for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the respondent.

Raymond D. Swan, Petitioner,
903 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. X. O'Brien for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Tucker Stevedoring Company, Petitioner,
904 vs.
Southwark Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Curtis Tilton for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Thruston Manning, Jr., for the respondent.

The Bank of Rulesville,
Petitioner,
905 vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Cutrer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. H. Watkins for the respondent.

Paul Balme, trading under the name and style of B. Paul,
Petitioner,
906 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Hart Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Adrien F. Busick for the respondent.

State Trust & Savings Bank,
Petitioner,
907 vs.
C. A. Dunn, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Rutledge, Jr. for the petitioner.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
909 vs.
Montrose Oil Refining Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. T. Miller, Mr. M. G. Roberts, Mr. W. E. Allen, and Mr. W. M. Odell for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. H. Ratcliff and Mr. Elias Goldstein for the respondent.

Elio Betty,
Petitioner,
913 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Holtzoff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Consolidated Iron-Steel Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
914 vs.
The Dunbar Brothers Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jerome S. Hess for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lucius F. Robinson for the respondent.

J. W. Goldsmith, as County Treasurer of Montrose County, etc., et al.,
Petitioner,
915 vs.
The Standard Chemical Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Stivers, Mr. Wm. L. Boatright, and Mr. Charles Roach for the petitioners, and by Mr. George L. Nye for the respondent.

W. M. Leftwich,
Petitioner,
916 vs.
The City of Albany.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. W. Godbey for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. J. Harris for the respondent.

Frank L. Speakman, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
E. R. Bernstein and E. M. Brown, Jr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen McReynolds for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Hunter for the respondents.

Agnes M. Logan, as Administratrix,
Petitioner,
919 vs.
Gravel Products Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas C. Burke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lawrence E. Caffey for the respondent.

Mattie Willis, now Rogers,
Petitioner,
920 vs.
Lodie Willis and Lonie Scott.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Ledbetter for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. P. Semple for the respondent.

Chase Securities Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
921 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert G. Dodge and Mr. F. H. Nash for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. Thomas E. Rhodes for the respondent.

David B. Driskill, Petitioner,
925 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earl Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

W. F. Sarber, Petitioner,
965 vs.
Aetna Life Insurance Company.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morris Bien for the petitioner.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of
John Stiedle, Administrator, etc.
——, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of Mr. Charles A. Ludlow for the petitioner.

Walter P. Raarup,
Petitioner,
—. vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and motion to require the clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to certify the record in the case of Osa J. Smythe v. The United States of America, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Smart for the petitioner.

Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc.,
Petitioner,
902 vs.
Baro Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, etc.

The motion for leave to file a brief as amicus curiae in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick Schwertner, and the motion was denied.

John P. Donnelley,
110 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles J. Kappler, in behalf of counsel for Donnelley, leave was granted to file a petition for a rehearing out of time under rule 30.

Harry Oriel and Joseph Comfino, individually, etc.,
Petitioners,
838 vs.
William E. Russell, Trustee, etc.

The motion to advance and to place this case upon the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Russell, pro se, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Hugo Levy for the petitioners, in opposition thereto.

Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company, Petitioner,
837 vs.
Louis Hubahman, Trustee, etc.

The motion to advance and to place this case upon the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Lion Cohen for the respondent, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Archibald Palmer for the petitioner, in opposition thereto.

City of New York and John F. Gilchrist, Leon C. Godley, et al., etc., Appellants,
——. vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Company and Manhattan Railway Company.

This case was argued on a motion to stay by Mr. Samuel Untermyer for the Transit Commission of the State of New York, by Mr. Charles L. Craig for the City of New York, and by Mr. William L. Ransom for the Interborough Rapid Transit Company and the Manhattan Railway Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock

MONDAY, MAY 21, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell, It is ordered that Edward M. Reidy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Werner W. Schroeder and Thomas A. Green, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that John M. Maloney, Esquire, of Ayer, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that Volney P. Mooney, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that Edward Brannon Casler, Jr. and Harry L. Thompson, Esquires, of Clearwater, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Combs, Jr., It is ordered that Edward Allan Setzler, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that John Patrick Doran, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that Robert Andrew Adams, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. McAdoo, It is ordered that C. B. McCullar, Esquire, of Milledgeville, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theo. B. Benson, It is ordered that Joseph R. Little, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Israel Bernstein, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel A. Lyme, It is ordered that Jackson R. Collins, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. O'Bear, It is ordered that Shelton Pitney, Esquire, of Morristown, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McAenney, It is ordered that Jacob Aronson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ben Jenkins, It is ordered that Joseph Hartman, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard F. Bresel, It is ordered that Homer W. Hall, Esquire, of Bloomington, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Josephine Stipcich,
97 vs.
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

On a Certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit,

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Republic of France, Compagnie Franco-Indo-Chinoise and Engineering Timber Company, Ltd., Petitioners,
459 vs.
French Overseas Corporation, as Owner of the Schooner, Malcolm Baxter, Jr.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Jerry R. McCoy,

Petitioner,

403 vs.

A. S. J. Shaw, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma, and The Pure Oil Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Southern Pacific Company, a Corporation, Petitioner,

472 vs.

Hildur Haglund, as Administratrix of the Estate of Ernest Haglund, Deceased, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Southern Pacific Company, a Corporation, Petitioner, 473 vs. Moore Shipbuilding Company, a Corporation, and Rolph Navigation & Coal Company, a Corporation, as Claimant of Tugs "Relief" and Hercules." — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, William W. Wheelock, and William G. Bierd, Receivers, etc., et al., Appellants, 404 vs. The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of Thomas E. Williams, Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska, et al. 16, Original. On petition for writ of mandamus and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

On consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus herein, and the return to the rule to show cause;

It is now here ordered by this Court, that the rule to show cause be discharged and the petition dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mark Skinner Willing and the Northern Trust Company, as Trustees, etc., et al., Petitioners, 561 vs. Chicago Auditorium Association. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Stone.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Walter P. Raarup,
Petitioner,
——. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter P. Raarup,
Petitioner,
——. vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. F. Sarber,
Petitioner,
965 vs.
Aetna Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. F. Barber,
Petitioner,
965 vs.
Aetna Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Prela, Trading as Selwell Blouse Company, Petitioner,
837 vs.
Louis Hubshman, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Samuel Prela, Trading as Selwell Blouse Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Oriel and Joseph Confino, Individually and as Members of the Firm of Oriel, Confino & Co.,
Petitioners,
838 vs.
William E. Russell, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Oriel, Confino & Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 1st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William G. Marsh,

Appellant,

994 vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

On consideration of the appeal heretofore allowed in this cause;

It is now here ordered by this Court that William G. Marsh do show cause before this Court, if any cause there be, in printed form, on or before Monday, May 28, 1928, why this case should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction in this Court under section 238 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the Act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 936, 938).

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of New York, John F. Gilchrist, et al., Constituting the Transit Commission of the State of New York,

Appellants,

——. vs.

Interborough Rapid Transit Company and Manhattan Railway Company.

On application for stay of order of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York granting interlocutory injunction.

Upon consideration of the motion of the appellants for a stay of the order granting an interlocutory injunction in this cause, and for the advancement of this case for an early hearing, it isnow here ordered by this Court that the operation of the order of the District Court, made May 10, 1928, granting an interlocutory injunction in this cause be stayed and remain inoperative pending the hearing and determination by this Court of the appeal in this cause, and that this case be advanced and set down for hearing in this Court on Tuesday, the second day of October, 1928.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Gas & Fuel Company and Equitable Trust Company, Petitioners,
876 vs.
J. M. Saunders, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Government of the Philippine Islands, on relation of the Attorney General, Petitioner,
813 vs.
El Hogar Filipino.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. Klengenberg, Petitioner,
878 vs.
H. Liebes & Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John D. Jewell, as Residuary Devisee and as Executor of the Will of Elizabeth C. Stockdale, deceased, Petitioner,

885 vs.

Edmund H. Graham, Administrator.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George A. Spirou, Petitioner,

887 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmer D. Means and Cephus W. Scott, Petitioner,

889 vs.

R. F. Terrell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said p tition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad Company and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioners,
893 vs.
Mrs. Janie D. Snelgrove, Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry B. Rose,
Petitioner,
895 vs.
Washington Times Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Humane Stanchion Works,
Petitioner,
900 vs.
Mitchell Mfg. Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. American Food Products Company (as substituted plaintiff for Morris & Co.) — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

901

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Baro Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, and the Stern-Merritt Company, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

902

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raymond D. Swan, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

903

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tucker Stevedoring Company, Petitioner, vs. Southwark Manufacturing Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

904

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bank of Ruleville, Petitioner, vs. Maryland Casualty Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

905

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul Balme, trading under the name and style of B. Paul, Petitioner, vs. Federal Trade Commission. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

906

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, St. Louis, San Francisco and Texas Railway Company, Petitioners, vs. Montrose Oil Refining Company, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

909

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered bythis Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elio Betty,

Petitioner,

913 vs.

Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Consolidated Iron-Steel Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,

914 vs.

The Dunbar Brothers Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. W. Goldsmith, as County Treasurer of Montrose County, State of Colorado, et al.,

Petitioners,

915 vs.

The Standard Chemical Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. M. Leftwich, Petitioner,
916 vs.
The City of Albany.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank L. Speakman, Trustee of the Bankrupt estate of the Tex-La-Homa Oil Corporation, Petitioner,
918 vs.
E. R. Bernstein and E. M. Brown, Jr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Agnes M. Logan, as Administratrix, Petitioner,
919 vs.
Gravel Products Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mattie Willis, now Rogers, Petitioner,
920 vs.
Lodie Willis and Lonie Scott.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chase Securities Corporation,
William G. Fitzpatrick, Joseph F. Guffey, et al., Petitioners,
921 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David B. Driskill, Petitioner,
925 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company and Manufacturers' Railway Company, Appellants,
980 vs.
The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission.
The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants,
981 vs.
The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company and Manufacturers' Railway Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellees in No. 980, and for the appellants in No. 981

James Walter Grigg, Petitioner,
941 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent, leave was granted to file a brief for the respondent on or before Monday next.

Sidney B. Sligh, Petitioner,
953 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent, leave was granted to file a brief for the respondent on or before Monday next.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company, Inc., Plaintiff in error,
699 vs.
Baton Rouge Rice Mill, Inc., et al.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. V. Porter and Mr. Joseph A. Loret for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Monte M. Lemann, and Mr. Walter J. Suthon, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

Cortez Oil Company,
Petitioner,
867 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Donald Horne, as amicus curiae.

The State of Louisiana,
Complainant,
9, Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

The motion to set this cause for hearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the complainant.

Thomas J. Casey,
Petitioner,
500 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Casey, pro se, leave was granted to file a brief for the petitioner, in support of the petition for a rehearing, by Thursday next.

L. F. Vance,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

On consideration of the motion to transfer the fund held in the custody of the Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois to the Clerk of this Court, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lash's Products Company,
Petitioner,
858 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. R. Serven and Mr. Richard D. Daniels for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Cortez Oil Company,
Petitioner,
867 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wayne Johnson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

John G. Georgouses and Pete C. Georgouses, Petitioners,
923 vs.
D. M. Gillen, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel White for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas A. Flynn for the respondents.

Chin Wah Kee,
Petitioner,
926 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Chin Toy,
Petitioner,
927 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
928 vs.
Corena Razook, joined by her husband, S. A. Razook.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. McKay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert L. Shipp for the respondent.

Clay Autin,
Petitioner,
931 vs.
Richard Piske, Trustee of the Estate of P. W. and E. Autin, Bankrupts.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex W. Swords and Mr. Loys Charbonnet for the petitioner.

Tom Luey,
Petitioner,
932 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Jackson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company,
Petitioner,
933 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary of State, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. T. Dick and Mr. Geo. B. Gillespie for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. Bayard Lacey Catron for the respondents.

New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
934 vs.
James Hendershot.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. C. Gebhardt for the respondent.

Thomas J. Norris and D. Clarence Gibboney, Jr., Administrators, etc., Petitioners,
936 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. C. Ladner and Mr. Albert H. Ladner, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum and Mr. Thomas E. Rhodes for the respondent.

Willis L. Watkins, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
937 vs.
Madison County Trust and Deposit Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Amariah F. Freeman for the petitioner, and by Mr. William F. Santry for the respondent.

Leon Ingrassia, Petitioner,
938 vs.
A. C. W. Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Dowe, Mr. Emerson R. Newell, and Mr. H. Dorsey Spencer for thepetitioner, and by Mr. Irving M. Obrieght for the respondent.

James Walter Grigg,
Petitioner,
941 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Loy J. Molumby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondent.

Daniel Michael McDonald,
Petitioner,
945 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. K. Jackson and Mr. J. Harry Covington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Michigan Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
946 vs.
George E. Mix and A. B. Frey,
Judges, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Houts and Mr. J. W. Dohany for the petitioner.

Eva Nieman,
Petitioner,
947 vs.
Plough Chemical Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Ramsey for the petitioner.

John W. Hill, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
948 vs.
Abraham Gerber, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice H. Rosen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Israel Bernstein for the respondents.

John Y. Fauntleroy, Former Collector, etc., Petitioner,
949 vs.
Elmer Candy Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Frank J. Ready, Jr., for the petitioner.

General Finance Corporation, Petitioner,
950 vs.
Penn-National Hardware Mutual and American Surety Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Culwell and Mr. Wm. H. Burges for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thornton Hardie for the respondent.

Sidney B. Sligh, Petitioner,
953 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Loy J. Molumby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parnum for the respondent.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,
---. vs.
The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This case was argued on a motion for stay by Mr. Herman Phleger for the appellant, and by Mr. Blackburn Esterline for the United States of America.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Russell P. Harker, Esquire, of Frankfort, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Kemp, It is ordered that Edward A. Cronin, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel C. Major, It is ordered that Rae C. Heiple, Esquire, of Washington, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis H. Stephens, It is ordered that William Cody Fletcher, and John R. Pendleton, Esquires, of Princeton, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moultrie Hitt, It is ordered that William Franklin Slaton, Jr., Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Shelton, It is ordered that Granville S. Borden, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Wallerstein, It is ordered that Abraham E. Hurshman, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Mathews, It is ordered that John F. Burton, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Penrose Hertzler, Esquire, of Port Royal, State of Pennsylvania, and Frank W. Melvin, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, It is ordered that Miles E. Evans, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Rathbone, It is ordered that Joseph Frederick Bratt, Esquire, of Westwood, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Quirk, It is ordered that Ralph S. Fowler, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick R. Gibbs, It is ordered that Charles Angulo, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that George E. Nicholas, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. August G. Gutheim, It is ordered that John B. Eichenauer, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Jeannette Willensky, It is ordered that Louis Halle, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands
of Sioux Indians,

Appellants, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

596 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

National Leather Company, In error to the Supreme Judicial

Plaintiff in error, Court of the State of Massachusetts.

205 vs.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

James A. Reed, Charles L. McNary,
William H. King, et al., etc.,

Petitioners,

744 vs.

The County Commissioners of
Delaware County, Pennsylvania; The
Prothonotary of Delaware County,
and John J. Sailing, etc., et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Quaker City Cab Company,

Plaintiff in error,

139 vs.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Rupert Ribnik,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Court of Errors and

569 vs. Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

Andrew F. McBride, Commissioner of

Labor of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Sanford.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Midland National Bank of On writ of certiorari to the United

Minneapolis, Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

425 vs. the Eighth Circuit.

Dakota Life Insurance Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with direction that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota in this cause be affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President under Transportation Act 1920, Petitioner, vs. Edward Goodyear, as Administrator of The Estate of Lewis Goodyear, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of John Steidle, Administrator. ——. Original.

Upon consideration of the motions of John Steidle for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus directed to the Hon. William Clark, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey; and that a rule be entered and issued directed to Hon. William Clark, Judge of the District Court, and to the District Court, to show cause why a writ of mandamus should not issue against them, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission. The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company et al.

980 981

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, October 1 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company, Inc., Plaintiff in error, vs. Baton Rouge Rice Mill, Inc., Mrs. Eudora S. Day, Sheriff of the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Burgin Brothers, et al.

699

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Louisiana, Complainant, vs. The State of Mississippi.

9, Original.

On consideration of the motion to set this case for hearing, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is set for hearing on Monday, October 1 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case be restored to the docket and set for reargument on Monday, October 1 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
—. vs.
United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,

On application for stay or suspension of operation of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission pending appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

On consideration of the motion for a stay or suspension of operation of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission pending appeal in the above entitled cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lash's Products Company,
Petitioner,
858 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State Trust & Savings Bank, Petitioner,
907 vs.
C. A. Dunn, Trustee of the Investment Bond & Mortgage Company, a Bankrupt.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel Michael McDonald, Petitioner,
945 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michigan Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
946 vs.
George E. Mix and A. B. Frey, Judges, etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Y. Fauntleroy, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Collection District of Louisiana,

Petitioner,

949 vs.

Elmer Candy Company, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cortez Oil Company,

Petitioner,

867 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John G. Georgouses and Pete C. Georgouses,

Petitioners,

923 vs.

D. M. Gillen, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of John G. Georgouses, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chin Wah Kee,
Petitioner,
926 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chin Toy,
Petitioner,
927 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
928 vs.
Corena Razook, joined by her husband, S. A. Razook.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clay Autin,

Petitioner,

931 vs.

Richard Piske, Trustee of the Estate of P. W. and E. Autin, Bankrupts.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom Luey,

Petitioner,

932 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Petitioner,

933 vs.

Louis L. Emmerson, as Secretary of State for the State of Illinois and Louis L. Emmerson, Individually.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
934 vs.
James Hendershot.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors & Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas J. Morris and D. Clarence Gibboney, Jr., Administrators, etc., Petitioners,
936 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian and Frank White, as Treasurer of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Willis L. Watkins, Administrator with the will annexed of the last will and testament of Elizabeth S. Eaton, deceased, etc., Petitioner,

937 vs.

Madison County Trust and Deposit Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Ingrassia, Petitioner,

938 vs.

A. C. W. Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eva Nieman, Petitioner,

947 vs.

Plough Chemical Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

John W. Hill, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Deering Ice Company,
Petitioner,
948 vs.
Abraham Gerber, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Finance Corporation,
Petitioner,
950 vs.
Penn-National Hardware Mutual and American Surety Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 884. The Portsmouth Harbor Land & Hotel Company, et al., petitioners, v. The United States.

No. 940. William Leather et al., petitioners, v. The United States.

No. 961. The Ellay Company, petitioner, v. Frank K. Bowers, Collector, etc.

No. 970. The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, petitioner, v. The United States.

No. 971. Albert Belland, et al., petitioners, v. The United States.

No. 982. David A. Smiler, petitioner, v. The United States.

No. 985. John M. Ralston, petitioner, v. D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.

No. 988. Edward E. Reick, petitioner, v. D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.

No. 990. Gee Wah Lee, petitioner, v. The United States.

No. 1007. John Winthrop Loveland, executor, etc., petitioner, v. The United States.

No. 1001. Charles W. Bowring, petitioner, v. Frank K. Bowers, Collector.

No. 1011. Jerry L. Echols, petitioner, v. The United States.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, the motion to direct the Clerk to submit the petitions for writs of certiorari in these cases before the expiration of the time provided by the rules was granted.

The Ellay Company,
Petitioner,
961 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector, etc.

The motion to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this case was denied, with leave to counsel for the petitioner to file a reply brief on or before Thursday next, on motion of Mr. Joseph R. Little for the petitioner.

The Portsmouth Harbor Land & Hotel Company, et al., Petitioners,
884 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Chauncey Hackett for the petitioners, leave was granted to file a brief for the petitioners, on or before Thursday, next.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al., Appellants, 404 vs. The United States of America et al.

The motion for the mandate in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Clark in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

State of Connecticut, Plaintiff, ——. Original. vs. State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the motion of the plaintiff to withdraw its motion for leave to file declaration and amended declaration in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Connecticut, Plaintiff, ——. Original. vs. State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the motion of the defendant to withdraw the motion for leave to file a plea and brief in opposition to the motion of the plaintiff for leave to file declaration and amended declaration in this cause, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. P. Lawrence, C. C. Taylor, et al., Appellants, 861 vs. St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Joseph Neale in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon G. Godley, et al., Appellants,
1016 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Company, et al.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby in behalf of Mr. Clarence M. Lewis, Mr. George P. Nicholson, Mr. Samuel Untermyer, and Mr. Charles L. Craig for the appellants, in support of the motion, and by Mr. James L. Quackenbush, Mr. William L. Ransom, and Mr. Jacob H. Goetz for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Wallace C. Gaines,
Plaintiff in error,
841 vs.
The State of Washington.

On consideration of the motion of counsel in behalf of the defendant in error to withdraw the certified transcript of the record in this cause filed in this Court, and to direct the Clerk of this Court to forward the same to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edwin A. Krauthoff,
Petitioner,
——. vs.
Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank of Kansas City, Mo. et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to submit the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause in advance of the time specified by the rules and to require the respondents to file a brief in opposition on or before Thursday next, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William C. Marsh, Appellant, vs. The United States of America. 994

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York, and rule to show cause thereupon issued.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chippiannock Cemetery Association, Petitioner, vs. City of Rock Island. 782

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merritt Starr, Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, and Mr. Richard S. Doyle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ben. T. Reidy for the respondent.

The Portsmouth Harbor Land & Hotel Company et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. 884

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey Hackett and Mr. James H. Lowell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney Galloway, and Mr. William W. Scott for the respondent.

Jens C. Nielsen, Administrator,
Petitioner,
930 vs.
R. E. Johnson, Treasurer of State.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Fletcher for the respondent.

Andrew L. Johnston,
Petitioner,
935 vs.
Sam S. Hiller, Sam S. Hiller, and S. S. Ball.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto C. Hauschild for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. L. Montgomery for the respondents.

Phil Kastel,
Petitioner,
939 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Hughes, Jr. and Mr. Wm. E. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

William Leather and Leon K. Leigh,
Petitioners,
940 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver J. Cook for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

North River Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
943 vs.
F. A. Wright.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Cutrer and Mr. R. L. McLaurin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cary C. Moody for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Salvadore Rios,
Petitioner,
944 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Cynthia R. Talcott, executrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
951 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy Mason and Mr. John C. Altman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Robert W. Brown,
Petitioner,
955 vs.
Cuno H. Rudolph and J. Frances Bell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Curtis for the petitioner, and by Mr. William W. Bride for the respondents.

Erastus W. Cadwell, Jesse Henry, et al.,
Petitioners,
956 vs.
Louis Teaney, John Fleming, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sol H. Searey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Cassius W. McMullen for the respondents.

The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner,
957 vs.
Alone Slater, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard L. Townsend for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry F. Payer for the respondent.

Illinois Northern Railway, Petitioner,
958 vs.
Regina Mikulecky, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the First District, State of Illinois, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David A. Orebaugh and Mr. Wm. S. Elliott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles C. Spencer for the respondent.

Jonathan Andrews and John R. Freeman, Petitioners,
959 vs.
Stephen Stone and William G. Heiner, as receivers, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., and Mr. Frank H. Swan for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. Fred Mercer, Mr. George E. Alter, and Mr. Alex J. Barron for the respondents.

The Ellay Company, Petitioner,
961 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank L. Weil for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

H. L. Fagin, D. A. Duncan, et al., Petitioners,
962 vs.
B. E. Quinn, M. F. Yount, and J. F. Guilmartin, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson Phillips and Mr. W. D. Gordon for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. L. Batts, Mr. Beeman Strong, and Mr. Will E. Orgain for the respondents.

City of Chelsea, Petitioner,
963 vs.
Thomas F. Dolan, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel R. Cutler for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Maloney for the respondent.

Robert L. Young, Petitioner,
964 vs
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Mannix for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Nashville Builders Supply Company and Aetna Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Petitioners,
967 vs.
Mrs. Arzie Bell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Keeble for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thos. J. Tyne and Mr. J. M. Peebles for the respondent.

G. W. Farris and Amos Farris, Petitioners,
968 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solon B. Clark for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,
970 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jennings C. Wise for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. George T. Stormont for the respondent.

Albert Belland, Harold Normandale, et al., Petitioners,
971 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas, Petitioner,
975 vs.
J. A. O'Connor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Eighth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Huff, Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, and Mr. A. H. McKnight for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

David A. Smiler,
Petitioner,
982 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. T. C. Crawford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

John M. Ralston,
Petitioner,
985 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Leo Rushlander and Mr. George H. Beneman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Edward E. Rieck,
Petitioner,
988 vs.
D. H. Heiner, Collector.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Walton and Mr. Clarence A. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Gee Wah Lee,
Petitioner,
990 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Charles W. Bowring,
Petitioner,
1001 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julius Henry Cohen and Mr. Kenneth Dayton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. John R. Wheeler for the respondent.

John Winthrop Loveland, as Executor, etc., et al., Petitioners,
1007 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Shelton Pitney and Mr. John R. Hardin, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondent.

Jerry L. Echols,
Petitioner,
1011 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bart A. Riley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1928 -

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Millar E. McGilchrist, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl D. Loos, It is ordered that Joseph Wallace Little, Esquire, of Asheville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Strong, It is ordered that Edward F. Higgins, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward H. Seal, It is ordered that Thomas M. Gavin, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Gwynn Gardiner, It is ordered that Arthur A. Olson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh C. Smith, It is ordered that Edward Chambers Betts, Esquire, of Huntsville, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. LeRoy L. Hight, It is ordered that Oscar McPeak and George S. Herr, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Orlin H. Graves, It is ordered that Thomas J. Farrar, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Lees, It is ordered that Josiah L. Carr, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Baker, It is ordered that F. Wright Moxley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

↑ See roll book signature #2112

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David H. Kincheloe, It is ordered that Solomon O. Heilbronner, Esquire, of Henderson, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Millenson, It is ordered that Samuel E. Kratzok, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Nathan Gammon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Stephen H. Abbey, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Edelin, It is ordered that Benjamin Siegel, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that Royal B. Binzer, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Eugene B. Sullivan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Madge LeeGuard, It is ordered that Eloise B. Cushing, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Madge LeeGuard, It is ordered that Harriet P. Tyler, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence F. Lea, It is ordered that Charles Forrest Curry, Jr., Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Arthur Manley Widdows, Esquire, of Tulsa , State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, It is ordered that Theodore L. Bartlett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Water, Jr., It is ordered that E. P. Blakemore, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Williamsport Wire Rope Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 337

On Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of J. D. Collins, Petitioner, ——. Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

National Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 228

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed. If within 10 days counsel can agree upon a decree for entry here, it may be presented. Otherwise the cause will be remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with this opinion.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Holmes, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Which consent decree filed pursuant to the above direction is in the words and figures following: "It is hereby ordered and adjudged that the judgment of the Court of Claims herein be reversed and that the cause be remanded to the Court of Claims with instructions to enter judgment for the

petitioner in the amount of $92,495.29 with interest at 6% to the date of such judgment, as follows:

On the amount of $22,834.40 from March 11, 1922.

On the amount of $23,415.79 from June 11, 1922,

On the amount of $23,122.55 from September 12, 1922,

On the amount of $23,122.55 from December 13, 1922.

June 12, 1928".

Claude L. Hemphill,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

343 vs. State of Michigan.

Julia Stott Orloff.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Kinney-Coastal Oil Company and Texas

Production Company, Petitioners, On writ of certiorari to the United

64 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

Michael F. Kieffer, Orpha M. the Eighth Circuit.

Kieffer, Herbert L. Leaming,

et al., etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming with directions to modify its decree in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Roy Olmstead, Jerry L. Finch,
Clarence G. Healy, et al.,
Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Charles S. Green, Emory A. Kern,
Z. J. Hendrick, et al.,
Petitioners,
532 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Edward H. McInnis,
Petitioner,
533 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Stone.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, William W. Wheelock and William G. Bierd, Receivers, etc., et al., Appellants,
404 vs.
The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, et al.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing and for modification of the opinion announced in this case, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said petition for rehearing and modification of the opinion in this cause be, and the same is hereby, denied; and the motion of the appellant that the mandate issue forthwith is granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. F. Lawrence, C. C. Taylor, Edwin Dabney, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company. 861

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 3, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon C. Godley and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Interborough Rapid Transit Company and Manhattan Railway Company. 1016

On consideration of the suggestion by the appellants of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up other papers in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, allowed, the papers to be brought up shall be separately printed and bound, and the cost of the printing of this addition to the record thus made shall be paid for by the appellants and shall be subject to future order as to costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Walter Grigg, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 941

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Walter Grigg,

Petitioner,

941 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that the respondent, the United States of America, has consented that the judgment of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in this cause be, vacated and set aside, and that the cause be remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings;

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, vacated and set aside; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sidney B. Sligh,

Petitioner,

953 vs.

The United States of America.

Order Allowing Certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sidney B. Sligh,
Petitioner,
953 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that the respondent, The United States of America, has consented that the judgment of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in this cause be vacated and set aside, and that the cause be remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings;

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, vacated and set aside; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chippiannock Cemetery Association,
Plaintiff in error,
782 vs.
City of Rock Island.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chippiannock Cemetery Association,
Petitioner,
782 vs.
City of Rock Island.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the

Jens C. Nielsen, Administrator, Petitioner,
930 vs.
R. E. Johnson, Treasurer of State.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Winthrop Loveland, as Executor of the Estate of Florence Lee Loveland, deceased, et al., Petitioners,
1007 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Portsmouth Harbor Land & Hotel Company, Carolina E. Peabody, Amory Eliot, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
884 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew L. Johnston,

Petitioner,

935 vs.

Sam S. Hiller, Sam S. Hiller and S. S. Ball.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Phil Kastel,

Petitioner,

939 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Leather and Leon K. Leigh, Petitioners,

940 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North River Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
943 vs.
F. A. Wright.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
ex rel. Salvadore Rios,
Petitioner,
944 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cynthia B. Talcott, executrix of the last will and testament of Jonathan R. Talcott, deceased, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

951 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Brown, Petitioner, vs. Cuno H. Rudolph and J. Frances Bell.

955 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erastus W. Cadwell, Jesse Henry, Carey White, et al., Petitioners, vs. Louis Teaney, John Fleming, Harley H. Hill, et al.

956 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Alone Slater, Administratrix of the Estate of Milton R. Slater. 957

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Illinois Northern Railway, Petitioner, vs. Regina Mikulecky, Administratrix of the Estate of Joseph F. Cihak, deceased. 958

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District, State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appeallte Court for the First District, State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jonathan Andrews and John R. Freeman, Petitioners, vs. Stephen Stone and William G. Heiner, as Receivers, etc., et al.

959

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Ellay Company, Petitioners, vs. Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

961

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. L. Fagin, D. A. Duncan, et al., Petitioners, vs. B. E. Quinn, M. F. Yount and J. F. Guilmartin, et al.

962

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

City of Chelsea,
Petitioner,
963 vs.
Thomas F. Dolan, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert L. Young,
Petitioner,
964 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nashville Builders Supply Company and Aetna Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut,
Petitioners,
967 vs.
Mrs. Arzie Bell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. W. Farris and Amos Farris, Petitioners,
968 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,
970 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Belland, Harold Normandale, Robert Cook, et al., Petitioners,
971 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas, Petitioner,
975 vs.
J. A. O'Connor.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 8th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 8th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David A. Smiler, Petitioner,
982 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John M. Ralston, Petitioner,
985 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, 23rd District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward E. Rieck,

Petitioner,

988 vs.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gee Wah Lee,

Petitioner,

990 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles W. Bowring,

Petitioner,

1001 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Jerry L. Echols, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 1011

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

ORDER

The Court has ordered to be advanced for hearing at the October Term, 1928, 18 cases and has tentatively set them for October 1st next. In order to advise counsel when the cases will probably be reached, they will be reset as follows:

Monday, October 1

No. 1016. John F. Gilchrist, Leon C. Godley, and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al., appellants, v. Interborough Rapid Transit Company, et al.

After the conclusion of the hearing of this case the time of the Court during the remainder of the week will be occupied in the disposition of the applications for writs of certiorari filed during the summer vacation and to be submitted on October 1.

Monday, October 8

No. 9, original. The State of Louisiana, complainant, v. The State of Mississippi.

No. 673. Louis K. Liggett Company, appellant, v. The Honorable Thomas J. Baldrige, Attorney General, etc.

After the close of the hearing in these cases the regular call and hearing of cases on the calendar will be begun.

Monday, October 15

No. 79. United Fuel Gas Company, appellant, v. The Public Service Commission of West Virginia et al.; and

No. 19. The United Fuel Gas Company et al., appellants, v. The Railroad Commission of Kentucky et al.

No. 551. Boston Sand & Gravel Company, petitioner, v. The United States of America.

Monday, October 22.

No. 788. Journeymen Stone Cutters Association of North America et al., appellants, v. The United States.

No. 634. Must Match Incubator Co., Inc., appellant, v. I. L. Patterson, Governor, etc.,

No. 910. Talbert W. Hughes, plaintiff in error, v. The State Board of Medical Examiners; and

No. 911. Nathan A. Hughes, plaintiff in error, v. The State Board of Medical Examiners.

No. 401. International Shoe Company, plaintiff in error, v. I. Pinkus, George Franklin, et al.

MONDAY, November 19

No. 607. The United States of America et al., appellants, v. Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

No. 833. J. Robert Cogen, petitioner, v. The United States of America.

No. 659. Botany Worsted Mills, petitioner, v. The United States.

No. 837. Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company, petitioner, v. Louis Hubshman, Trustee; and

No. 838, Harry Oriel and Joseph Confino, individually, etc., petitioners, v. William E. Russell, Trustee, etc.

Monday, November 26.

No. 15, original. The State of Colorado, complainant, v. The State of Kansas, et al.

No. 740. W. A. Frost, doing business, etc., appellant, v. Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.

Monday, December 3

No. 861. J. F. Lawrence, C. C. Taylor, et al., appellants, v. St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

Wednesday, January 2, 1929

No. 980. The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company et al., appellants, v. The United States, et al.; and

No. 981. The United States of America et al., appellants, v. The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company, et al.

It is the order of the Court that the hearing of the cas s above reset shall not be delayed except that the case in hearing on the Friday preceding the Monday of the setting shall be concluded, but shall not be delayed to permit the hearing of the cases set for the preceding Friday, the hearing of which has not begun.

Nicholas Lee Eagles, Samuel Moreno, and John Proctor, Petitioners, 1006 vs. The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent, the motion to direct the Clerk to submit the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case was granted.

Nicholas Lee Eagles, Samuel Moreno, and John Proctor, Petitioners, 1006 vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, Mr. R. H. Yeatman, May T. Bigelow, Mr. Hyman M. Goldstein, and Mr. Martin F. O'Donoghue for the petitioners. The filing of a brief in opposition waived by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Thomas J. Casey,

Petitioner,

500 vs.

The United States of America.

The motion for leave to file a second petition for rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Casey, pro se.

The Chief Justice announced:

Certain amendments to the rules of this Court having been proposed by a committee of the Court and presented for consideration, the adoption of such amendments will be announced hereafter.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

ORDER

The revision of the rules of this Court has been this day lodged with the Clerk, and it is here ordered that the said rules shall become effective July 1, 1928, and be printed as an appendix to 275 U. S. The rules promulgated June 8, 1925, appearing in 266 U. S. Appendix, and all amendments thereof are rescinded, but this shall not affect any proper action taken under them before the rules hereby adopted become effective.

Thomas J. Casey,
Petitioner,
500 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a second petition for rehearing, it is now here ordered by this Court, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nicholas Lee Eagles, Samuel Moreno, and John Proctor, Petitioners,
1006 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Van Devanter announced the following order of the Court:

Elizabeth C. Taft, Petitioner,
554 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.
Gilbert C. Greenway, Jr., Petitioner,
575 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

It is ordered that these cases be and the same are hereby, restored to the docket for a reargument.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order of the Court:

It is now here ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket not decided [illegible], and all other business of the term not disposed of, be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by law.

VOL

19

UME

28

MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1928

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present Seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 1st day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and twenty-eight and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and fifty-third , The Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse P. Crawford, It is ordered that John P. Beale, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Reid, It is ordered that Thomas W. Phillips, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carmen A. Newcomb, Jr., It is ordered that Isaac Jacob Silin, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Sleman, It is ordered that Joseph B. McKeon, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry B. Thompson, It is ordered that Philemnn S. Karshner, Esquire, of Adelphi, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Irwin Blaisdell, It is ordered that Hiram S. Hunn, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond S. Williams, It is ordered that Thomas J. Tingley and Henry H. Waters, Esquires, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isidore Hershfield, It is ordered that Solomon J. Rosenblum, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin H. Farrington, It is ordered that Philip H. Treacy, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Leslie L. Conner, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, It is ordered that Hugh Lamar Stone and Jno. E. Green, Jr., Esquires, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sylvester L. McLaurin, It is ordered that Ambrose Shief, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chas. J. Williamson, It is ordered that Cyrus Walker Rice and William Cyrus Rice, Esquires, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Jose F. Dimayuga and Alfredo Bonus Guazon, Esquires, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Lester Quackenbush, It is ordered that James Lewis Quackenbush, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Howard A.Adams, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chas. A. Douglass, It is ordered that Irwin Untermyer, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Amasa M. Holcombe, It is ordered that Raymond Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Craig, It is ordered that James J. Walker, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Adelaide F. Chapman,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Court

25 vs. of Claims.

The United States.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and he having filed a motion and moved the Court to vacate the judgment of the Court of Claims and remand the cause to said Court with directions to enter judgment for the petitioner, with interest;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated.

And it is further ordered, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims with directions to enter judgment for the petitioner for the sum of $64,199.00, with interest thereon at the rate of six per cent. from May 25, 1923, to a date preceding the date of the refund check by not more than thirty days, such date to be determined by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
46 vs.
Cambridge Loan and Building Company.

The motion to remand this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, in support of the motion, and by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Verde River Irrigation & Power Company, Petitioner,
174 vs.
Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior and William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell suggesting the resignation of Hubert Work, as Secretary of the Interior, a party respondent in this cause, and he having moved the Court to substitute Roy O. West, Secretary of the Interior, as a party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Firemen's Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey,
Appellant,
376 vs.
James A. Beha, as Superintendent, etc.

The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wendell P. Barker and Mr. John W. Davis for the appellant, and by Mr. Albert Ottinger for the appellee.

Mark Dowell,
Petitioner,
344 vs.
The People of the State of California.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Joseph I. McMullen, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause;

There fore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas et al.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, leave was granted to file a reply brief of the defendants.

Jorgensen-Bennett Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
230 vs.
Will S. Knight, Sheriff, et al.

The motion for leave to file a substituted record in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry H. Semmes for the appellant.

John G. Rouse, Executor of the Will of William C. Rouse,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Herbert Levy in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of Maryland, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

John G. Rouse, Executor of the Will of William C. Rouse,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Herbert Levy in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of Connecticut, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

John G. Rouse, Executor of the Will of William C. Rouse,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Edwin A. Harriman in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of Florida, as amicus curiae, in this cause within two weeks.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon G. Godley and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
159 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Company and Manhattan Railway Co.

On consideration of the motion to reassign this cause for argument on October 15, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Gilchrist, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
159 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Company et al.

O R D E R

The Court, after reading the statements made by the counsel in this case, assigns four hours to be occupied by the appellants—three hours in the opening and one hour in the closing. The counsel for the Transit Commission will open the case, occupying one hour and one-half, to be followed by the counsel for the city, occupying one hour and one half. The appellees will follow the opening arguments with three hours of argument, to be divided between their two counsel as they may agree. The argument for the appellees will be followed by one-half hour in closing by the same counsel for the city

of New York and one-half hour in closing by the same counsel for the Transit Commission. This will close the case.

Argument will be permitted from only two counsel for the appellants—one for the Transit Commission and one for the city of New York—and from two counsel for the appellees combined.

The Court has divided the time of argument allowed to the appellants because their counsel have been unable to agree.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte:
In the matter of The Bakelite Corporation, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert MacC. Barnes, Jr., for the petitioner.

Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
71 vs.
Standard Oil Company.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Harry L. Underwood suggesting the resignation of Hubert Work, as Secretary of the Interior, party petitioner in this cause, and he having moved the Court to substitute Roy O. West, Secretary of the Interior, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Roxburghe, Petitioner,
121 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Francis V. Barstow and Harold S. Davis, as amici curiae, in this cause.

George J. J. Mackay,
Plaintiff in error,
274 vs.
The State of Ohio.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw the appearances of Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., and Mr. Robert T. Scott, as counsel for the plaintiff in error in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte:
In the matter of the Public National Bank of New York, Petitioner.
——. Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, Mr. Henry L. Moses, Mr. Martin Saxe, Mr. Robert C. Beatty, and Mr. Herman G. Kopald for the petitioner, in support of the motion. Statementon behalf of Andrew B. Keating, as receiver of taxes of the city of New York, and William Reid, Jr., as city collector, submitted by Mr. William H. King, Mr. George P. Nicholson, and Mr. Eugene Fay in that behalf.

Ex Parte:
In the Matter of the Public National Bank of New York, Petitioner.
——. Original.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, on behalf of Mr. Albert Ottinger, for the State of New York, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of New York in support of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus.

Verde River Irrigation & Power Co., Petitioner,
174 vs.
Roy O. West, Secretary of the Interior and Wm. Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

On consideration of the motions to postpone the submission of the petition for the writ of certiorari for ninety days in this cause pending ratification of agreement to settle the case; and for leave to the respondent to file brief within twenty days from the date of the submission of the petition;

It is now here ordered that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New River Collieries, a corporation, et al., Petitioners,
237 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles L. Guerin for the petitioners.

City of Philadelphia, ex relatione Daniel J. Furey, taxpayer, et al., Appellants,
5 vs.
Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company, Wm. D. B. Ainey, James S. Benn, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss the appeal in this cause without prejudice, but with costs has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without prejudice, but with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Miller & Lux, Incorporated,

Plaintiff in error,

6 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, H. W. Brundige, C. L. Seavey et al., etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, each party to pay its own costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wisconsin, ex rel. Walter J. Berger,

Plaintiff in error,

9 vs.

Wm. J. Carey, as County Clerk of the County of Milwaukee and Wm. J. Carey, as Clerk, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wisconsin, ex rel.
Mathilda W. Berger,
Plaintiff in error,
10 vs.
Wm. J. Carey, as County Clerk of the County of Milwaukee and Wm. J. Carey, as Clerk, etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stanley Yale Beach,
Plaintiff in error,
66 vs.
Margaret A. Beach and The First National Bank of Bridgeport.

In error to the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record,

It is therefore, in pursuance of the thirteenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1928 - CONTINUED

The State of Montana ex rel.
Janet T. Ingersoll,
Plaintiff in error,
112 vs.
Charles H. Clapp, as President of the State University at Missoula, Montana, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, it is therefore, in pursuance of the thirteenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isom Grayson, Micey Keys, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
116 vs.
James A. Harris, William H. Harris, et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Blair for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

Isom Grayson, Micey Keys, et al.,
Petitioners,
116 vs.
James A. Harris, William H. Harris, et al.

The motion by petitioners for a writ of certiorari ancillary to the writ of error under section 237 (c) of the Judicial Code as amended by the act of February 13, 1925, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the petitioners.

General Refractories Company,
Petitioner,
292 vs.
Ashland Fire Brick Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Norman Breaux Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in error, and appellant,
295 vs.
W. H. Reed, Tax Collector, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. T. Kennedy for the defendant in error and appellee, in support of the motion, and by Mr. R. C. Milling for the plaintiff in error and appellant, in opposition thereto.

Mrs. J. B. Ellis,
Petitioner,
178 vs.
Associated Industries Insurance Corporation.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Carrigan for the petitioner.

Lee Hawkins,
Petitioner,
284 vs.
F. P. Pulley and C. L. Davis, Trustee.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. Melendez King for the petitioner.

Mrs. Widow Wilfred Guillot,
Plaintiff in error, and appellant
380 vs.
Louisiana Railway and Navigation Company.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. Widow Wilfred Guillot, pro se.

Gladys Anderson and her husband Chet Anderson,
Petitioners,
390 vs.
McGill Club.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Gladys Anderson, pro se.

Paul Schainman,
Petitioner,
120 vs.
W. E. Dean, as Trustee of the Estate of Isadore Lichtenberg, a bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence A. Linn for the petitioner.

Mary Roxburghe,
Petitioner,
121 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger Hinds and Mr. Edward F. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Dollar Steamship Line, owner of the S. S. "Melville Dollar,"
Petitioner,
122 vs.
Matson Navigation Co., owner of the S. S. "Mauna Ala."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Denman for the respondent.

The Victor-American Fuel Company,
Petitioner,
123 vs.
Huerfano Agency Company, The Brennan Coal Mining Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kenaz Huffman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse C. Northcutt for the respondents.

Ben S. Thurlow, Mary Thurlow, et al.,
Petitioners,
124 vs.
Waite Phillips Company, et al.
A. P. Douthit,
Petitioner,
125 vs.
Waite Phillips Company, et al.
Ike E. Nelson, Hattie Nelson, et al.,
Petitioners,
126 vs.
Waite Phillips Company, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long , Mr. F. Dumont Smith, Mr. Austin M. Cowan, and Mr. W. E. Stanley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Samuel W. Hayes, Mr. David A. Richardson Mr. wm. H. Zwick, Mr. John H. Brennan, Mr. R. B. F. Hummer, and Mr. T. A. Nottger for the respondents.

Grattan D. Phillips, Jr.,
Petitioner,
127 vs.
Margaret A. Phillips, Individually and as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Grant for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. McNab for the respondent.

Sanitary Refrigerator Co.,
Petitioner,
128 vs.
Alexander F. Winters and Basil C. Crampton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Hayward Fairbanks for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., for the respondents.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
133 vs.
Tobe Stapleton, by his statutory guardian, Marion Stapleton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. LeWright Browning for the petitioner, and by Mr. George B. Martin for the respondent.

John Henderson, Petitioner,
134 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Henderson, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Abe Washington, Petitioner,
136 vs.
The State of Florida.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred H. Davis for the respondent.

The People of the State of New York on the relation of Thomas H. Hayes, Petitioner,
137 vs.
George V. McLaughlin, as Police Commissioner of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Harper and Mr. Ben A. Matthews for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joab H. Banton and Mr. George Gordon Battle for the respondent.

Samuel Zemurray,
Petitioner,
138 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. Edward B. Burling, and Mr. Spencer Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Nellie Bartlett Chase,
Petitioner,
139 vs.
Charles W. Bartlett, Guardian.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Karl D. Loos for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry S. Conrad and Mr. L. E. Durham for the respondent.

California Wine Association of New York, Inc., Petitioner,
140 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Cantrel and Mr. Stanleigh P. Friedman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

John Irving,
Petitioner,
141 vs.
Alexander Barker.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner.

The Belt Railway Company of Chicago, Petitioner,
142 vs.
Ola Pfeifer, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen C. Mills for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles C. Spencer for the respondent.

James A. Hewes and Frank W. Potter, Petitioners,
143 vs.
S. Deiches & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Perkins for the petitioners, and by Mr. George P. Fisher for the respondent.

Alex Mudd, Petitioner,
144 vs.
Samuel A. Perry, Charles B. Rogers, and Jasper S. Martin, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Orion L. Rider, Mr. A. R. Serven, Mr. John Barry, and Mr. W. R. Bleakmore for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. E. McNeill and Mr. Charles B. Rogers for the respondents.

Hubert F. Laugharn, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
145 vs.
Celia Chandler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis J. Canepa for the petitioner.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
146 vs.
Frank K. Bowers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry W. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Ralph E. Smith for the respondent.

Tyler County, Texas, G. C. Bradfield, et al.,
Petitioners,
149 vs.
F. P. Town.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Gordon for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. S. Hunt for the respondent.

Cudahy Packing Company,
Petitioner,
150 vs.
City of Omaha and Metropolitan Utilities District, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. C. Kennedy and Mr. Geo. T. Buckingham for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Lee Webster and Mr. Dana B. Van Dusen for the respondents.

Lydia M. Green, individually, etc.,
Petitioner,
152 vs.
Victor Talking Machine Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph F. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Schurman for the respondent.

Albert Pick & Company,
Petitioner,
153 vs.
W. K. Holt, J. B. McCoy, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel E. Hirsch and Mr. Frank P. Hobgood, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Cleveland Davis for the respondents.

Roberta T. Lyon,
Petitioner,
154 vs.
The Travellers' Protective Association of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Hines for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Holland, Jr., for the respondent.

Rice and Adams Corporation,
Petitioner,
155 vs.
Harry D. Lathrop.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles J. Staples and Mr. William P. Conley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts for the respondent.

American Surety Company of New York,
Petitioner,
156 vs.
Cove Irrigation District.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sterling M. Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Johnston for the respondent.

Nevada-California-Oregon Railway Company, Petitioner,
158 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Elliott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Sydney F. Andres for the respondent.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
160 vs.
J. E. Kirk.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. T. Loyall and Mr. H. T. Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Cody Fletcher and Mr. John R. Pendleton for the respondent.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company Petitioner,
162 vs.
William Blankenhorn, Ford Motor Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maxwell McNutt for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. F. Williamson for the respondents.

Harold F. Reed, Petitioner,
163 vs.
National Surety Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Franklin F. Phillips for the petitioner, and by Mr. George H. Brown for the respondent.

County of Spokane and County of Whitman, Washington,
Petitioners,
164 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Greenough and Mr. A. O. Colburn for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Andrew Jackson,
Petitioner,
165 vs.
W. C. Evans.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson for the petitioner.

The District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
167 vs.
Oscar Wilkinson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Bride and Mr. Robert L. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Meyer Lewin for the respondent.

James E. Brady and Arthur J. Baxter,
Petitioners,
168 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde Taylor for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Paul Cappa,
Petitioner,
170 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence J. Hartley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Capital Traction Company,
Petitioner,
171 vs.
Alvin L. Newmyer, administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hogan and Mr. Edmund L. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer for the respondent.

Kate W. Rosenberger,
Petitioner,
172 vs.
Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Fourth and Central Trust Company, Sole Surviving Executor of the Estate of James E. Mooney, deceased,
Petitioner,
175 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. C. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the respondent.

Abraham P. Waxman,
Petitioner,
176 vs.
Channing Pollock, Edgar Selwyn, and Arch Selwyn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abraham P. Waxman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur F. Driscoll for the respondent.

Southern Surety Company of Des Moines, Iowa, Petitioner,
177 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. H. Salinger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. James A. Jordan,
Petitioner,
180 vs.
John H. Glass, United States Marshal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reese H. Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Jacob Mayer,
Petitioner,
188 vs.
John H. Glass, United States Marshal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reese Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. William A. Quinn, Petitioner,
202 vs.
John H. Glass, United States Marshal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Balentine for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. William V. Loughran, Petitioner,
206 vs.
John H. Glass, United States Marshal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Lester Lord, Jr., Petitioner,
207 vs.
John H. Glass, United States Marshal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Jacob Schliff and Abraham Schliff, copartners, etc., Petitioners,
181 vs.
Eagle and Star British Dominions Insurance Company, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin Reese and Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. Jacob B. Engel for the respondent.

Allie E. Lewis and William Lloyd Lewis, Petitioners,
182 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Finis E. Riddle for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Henry Leonard, Petitioner,
183 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King, Mr. William B. King, and Mr. George R. Shields for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. William W. Scott for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner,
184 vs.
Industrial Commission of Utah and Joseph Surrage.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emmett M. Bagley and Mr. Paul H. Ray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harvey H. Cluff for the respondent.

K. C. Lee and Chew Fook Gum,
Petitioners,
185 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hennessy and Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. John T. Fowler, Jr., for the respondent.

Henry Kuhn,
Petitioner,
199 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold C. Faulkner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. John T. Fowler, Jr., for the respondent.

Leong Duck,
Petitioner,
359 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Gottesfeld for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondent.

T. Hogan & Sons, Inc.,
Petitioner,
187 vs.
L. Boyers' Sons Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eli J. Blair for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. C. Sherwood for the respondent.

L. Boyer's Sons Company,
Petitioner,
217 vs.
T. Hogan & Sons, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Sherwood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Eli J. Blair for the respondent.

Paul T. McFarland, as County Treasurer, etc.,
Petitioner,
189 vs.
The Central National Bank of Topeka, Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene S. Quinton and Mr. Alfred B. Quinton for the petitioners and by Mr. S. M. Brewster and Mr. J. L. Hunt for the respondent.

Chin Thyn,
Petitioner,
190 vs.
Victor Loisel, U. S. Marshal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex W. Swords for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Joseph U. Barnes,
Petitioner,
191 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. H. Boutelle and Mr. A. H. David for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

County of Delaware, Pennsylvania, Petitioner, 192 vs. United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald S. Edmonds for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.
School District of Tinicum Township, Pennsylvania, Petitioner, 193 vs. United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.	
The United States of America, Petitioner, 195 vs. Oscar Edvin Ferdinand Persson.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 196 vs. Marco Nicolich.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.
P. N. Salisbury, Petitioner, 197 vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Brady, Mr. T. F. Railsback, and Mr. J. Francis O'Sullivan for the petitioner.

Arthur J. Harnuth, United States Director of Immigration et al., Petitioners,
198 vs.
United States of America, on the petition of Preston M. Albro, an Attorney, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles D. Council for the respondent.

John W. LeCrone, Receiver, Petitioner,
200 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George N. Baxter and Mr. Thomas Sterling for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Calloway, and Mr. P. M. Cox for the respondent.

United States Fire Insurance Company of the City of New York, Petitioner,
201 vs.
Joseph B. Sullivan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick D. Silber for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clement L. Waldron, Mr. Harry Silverman and Mr. L. Ross Newkirk for the respondent.

Chin Mon ex rel. Chin Yuen, Petitioner,
203 vs.
Anna C. M. Tillinghast, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. F. Damon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

U. S. Industrial Chemical Co., Inc., and Sterno Corporation, Petitioners,
204 vs.
The Theroz Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. T. P. Warfield, Mr. Hersey Eggleston, and Mr. Lawrence Bristol for the petitioners, and by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the respondent.

The State of Oregon ex rel. I. H. Van Winkle, Attorney General, Petitioner,
211 vs.
John C. Siegmund, County Judge, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle and Mr. Willis S. Moore for the petitioner, and by Mr. Irvine L. Lenroot, Mr. John H. Carson, and Mr. Guy Cordon for the respondents.

Leo J. Wallenstein and Paul Comora, Petitioners,
212 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward P. Stout for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

John Steille, as Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
213 vs.
Reading Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Ludlow for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach for the respondent.

F. W. Mattheissen, Jr.,
Petitioner,
214 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. M. Rinaker and Mr. M. F. Gallagher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

James A. Sackley Company,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Williams and Mr. Matthias Concannon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

C. B. Cottrell & Sons Company,
Petitioner,
216 vs.
Claybourn Process Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Seward for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Quarles for the respondent.

Sol Rubin,
Petitioner,
218 vs.
Samuel Midlinsky,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob C. Grossberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick D. Silber for the respondent.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
219 vs.
John Koske.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic B. Scott for the petitioner, and by Mr. I. Faerber Goldenhorn and Mr. Saul Nemser for the respondent.

John Johnson, Petitioner,
220 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas B. Axtell and Mr. Charles A. Ellis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Alexander Eccles & Company, Petitioner,
221 vs.
Strachan Shipping Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward C. Brennan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel B. Adams and Mr. A. Pratt Adams for the respondent.

Pan American Petroleum & Transport Company, Petitioner,
222 vs.
Steamship "Virginia," Texas Steamship Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. Frederic Conger for the petitioner, and by Mr. James K. Symmers for the respondents.

Washington and Old Dominion Railway, a corporation, Petitioner,
223 vs.
Arthur W. McPherson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Crandal Mackey for the respondent.

Northern Oklahoma Railways, Guy Patten, et al., Petitioners,
224 vs.
Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy Patten for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Charles S. Burg, and Mr. Maurice D. Green for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
225 vs.
Marcella Driggers, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Simeon Hyde for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. D. E. Meyer for the respondent.

Raul Rogerio Gonzalez, by his Guardian, etc., Petitioner,
226 vs.
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, and Mr. Allison D. Gibbs for the petitioner.

Ballard & Ballard Co.,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
Munson Steamship Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Garnett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cletus Keating for the respondent.

Robert W. Johnson, Jr., John S. Johnson et al.,
Petitioners,
228 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul F. Myers for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Dwight E. Rorer for the respondent.

Angelo Benese,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Jackson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

T. B. Hord Grain Company,
Petitioner,
231 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earle W. Wallick and Mr. Ben Jenkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Frank H. Mesce,
Petitioner,
232 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maclay Hoyne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Consolidated Gas Electric Light and Power Company of Baltimore,
Petitioner,
233 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Markell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

The Western & Atlantic Railroad,
Petitioner,
234 vs.
Mrs. Nora E. Hughes, Administratrix of the Estate of Ira L. Hughes, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall, Mr. Frank Slemons, and Mr. John L. Tye for the petitioner, and by Mr. Reuben R. Arnold for the respondent.

Hallie Burton and H. I. Burton, Heirs at Law of John W. Burton, deceased, Petitioners,
235 vs.
John W. Haas, John C. Trichel, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Quinn for the petitioners.

J. R. Poste,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward B. Burling, Mr. Spencer Gordon, and Mr. Henry Gumble for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd, and Mr. McClure Kelley for the respondent.

The New River Collieries Company et al.,
Petitioners,
237 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Jr., Mr. Charles L. Guerin, and Mr. Francis Shunk Brown for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. James J. Lenihan for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
238 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company, Lessee of the Boston & Albany Railroad.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. John Stewart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ben B. Cain and Mr. George H. Fernald, Jr., for the respondent.

Emilio Gorbea, Trustee, et al.,
Petitioners,
239 vs.
Credito Y. Ahorro Ponceno.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh R. Francis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Jose A. Poventud, Mr. Hollis R. Bailey, and Mr. Alberto S. Poventud for the respondent.

Albert Marco and Antonio Bruno Petitioners,
240 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas P. White and Mr. Harold C. Faulkner for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The People of the State of California, Petitioner,
241 vs.
William M. Mouse.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. S. Webb for the petitioner.

The New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner,
242 vs.
Christian Biermacher.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. T. Kinder for the petitioner, and by Mr. David F. Anderson for the respondent.

Missouri Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
243 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace S. Whitman and Mr. George H. Parker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

Presley M. Ireland,
Petitioner,
244 vs.
John W. Keister et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. M. Ireland, pro se.

Tom Ung Chai, alias Tom Gum Hin,
Petitioner,
245 vs.
A. E. Burnett, as Immigration Inspector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. G. M. Robertson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. George C. Buttle for the respondent.

Stout Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
246 vs.
H. R. Hayes.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson, Mr. W. S. Wilkinson, and Mr. C. H. Lewis for the petitioner.

Ernest L. Benway,
Petitioner,
247 vs.
People of the State of Michigan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Meyer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wilbur M. Brucker for the respondent.

The Baker & Taylor Co., Petitioner,
248 vs.
The United States of America.
The Baker & Taylor Co., Petitioner,
249 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, individually, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Russell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Wyoming National Bank of Casper, Wyoming, Petitioner,
250 vs.
The Omaha National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Halleck F. Rose, Mr. Arthur R. Wells, and Mr. Paul L. Martin for the respondents.

Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
251 vs.
Warner, Barnes & Co., Ltd.
Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
252 vs.
J. M. Menzi.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. J. A. Hull for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clyde Alton DeWitt and Mr. Eugene Arthur Perkins for the respondents.

Orville E. Babcock et al., Petitioners,
254 vs.
James H. Wilkerson, District Judge.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Robbins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Horace K. Tenney and Mr. James M. Sheean for the respondent.

Orenstein and Koppel Aktiengesellschaft et al., Petitioners,
255 vs.
Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert Stickney and Mr. Robert J. Dodds for the respondent.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis, Petitioner,
256 vs.
Pearl Lena Potterfield, administratrix of the estate of Earl Wade Potterfield, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Howell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney Thorne Able for the respondent.

City and County of Denver, Petitioner,
257 vs.
The Denver Tramway Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Gibson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gerald Hughes and Mr. Clayton C. Dorsey for the respondent.

Charles L. Overlander,
Petitioner,
258 vs.
Jesse L. Overlander and Federal Trust Company of Lincoln, Nebraska.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and / or District Court of the State of Kansas, Doniphan County, Twenty-second Judicial District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob A. Overlander for the petitioner.

Elizabeth J. Sugrue and Margaret McKay,
Petitioners,
259 vs.
Sheldon W. Crilley, otherwise known as Sheldon W. Cook, Jr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George R. Sheriff, Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, and Mr. Andrew R. Sherriff, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Werner W. Schroeder for the respondent.

Newell B. Wallace,
Petitioner,
261 vs.
Motor Products Corporation et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred Lucking and Mr. Howell Van Auken for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles B. Warren and Mr. Sherwin A. Hill for the respondents.

Edouard Saadi,
Petitioner,
262 vs.
Walter E. Carr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Wylie for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Triumph Trap Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
Walter A. Gibbs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Wilson and Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. A. Howson and Mr. Hubert Howson for the respondent.

The Davenport Oil Company,
Petitioner,
264 vs.
Charles G. Davenport.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke for the petitioner.

Charles Paridy and Anna McLatchie,
Petitioners,
265 vs.
The Caterpillar Tractor Company, substituted as defendant for the Holt Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward E. Longan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank T. Miller and Mr. Allen L. Chickering for the respondent.

Christine Hopkins,
Petitioner,
266 vs.
The State of Washington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Miller for the petitioner.

Ithaca Trust Company, Sole Surviving Executor, etc., Petitioner,
267 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Simon Lyon and Mr. R. B. H. Lyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent.

Walker Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
268 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marvin Farrington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the respondent.

Pettibone-Mulliken Company, Petitioner,
269 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company, Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan L. Miller, Mr. Kemper K. Knapp, and Mr. J. H. Hershberger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin S. S. Sunderland and Mr. Warren S. Carter for the respondents.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha, Petitioner,
270 vs.
Olivier Straw Goods Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Crandall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry M. Longley for the respondent.

Max Gordon,
Petitioner,
271 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David V. Cahill and Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

"Lefty" Clayton, alias John Doucett,
Petitioner,
301 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

W. A. Marshall & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
272 vs.
Steamship "President Arthur," her engines, boilers, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Wright Hinckley for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. Chauncey E. Treadwell, and Mr. William J. Hughes for the respondent.

William C. Atwater & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
275 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. John L. Steinbugler, and Mr. Spencer Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. James J. Lenihan for the respondent.

Daniel Machin and Austin A. Cooper, Petitioners,
276 vs.
Nicollet Hotel, Incorporated, Glen S. Dixson, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. H. Boutelle for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. B. Faegre for the respondents.

H. Leslie Parker, Petitioner,
277 vs.
Harry F. Sinclair.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, Mr. Dudley W. Strickland, Mr. Joseph D. Houston, and Mr. Chester I. Long for the petitioner, and by Mr. Martin W. Littleton, Mr. G. T. Stanford, Mr. Edward H. Chandler, and Mr. R. W. Rayland for the respondent.

Harry Shellenbarger, Petitioner,
280 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward C. Turner for the respondent.

H. J. Bosler, Hal. H. Pell, et al., Petitioners,
281 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur L. Adams for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondent.

Nicholas Colla and G. DeCola, partners, etc., Petitioners,
282 vs.
Bank of Italy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Osborne Mitchell for the petitioners, and by Mr. L. A. Manchester for the respondent.

W. C. Tucker, Petitioner,
283 vs.
Acel C. Alexander, as Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Garnett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. T. J. Lewis, Jr., for the respondent.

Sound Motor Boat Service, Inc., Petitioner,
285 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Arthur W. Henderson for the respondent.

Sam Seldin, Petitioner,
286 vs.
The Threadneedle Insurance Company (1923) Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wendell P. Barker and Mr. Frank I. Tierney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jacob B. Engel for the respondent.

Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
287 vs.
Magnolia Provision Company.
Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner,
288 vs.
Magnolia Provision Company.
Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner,
289 vs.
Houston Packing Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. L. Cook, Mr. W. M. Streetman, Mr. H. M. Garwood, and Mr. J. H. Tallichet for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. C. Fulbright for the respondents.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
290 vs.
William Henry Woolen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parnum for the petitioner.

Zenith-Detroit Corporation, Petitioner,
291 vs.
Stromberg Motor Devices Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., Mr. William J. Belknap, and Mr. Earle L. Parmelee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Houston Kenyon and Mr. Charles A. Brown for the respondent.

E. B. Barton,
Petitioner,
293 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. B. Barton, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
294 vs.
J. L. Mectaux.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Janver for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
297 vs.
Nelita Franklin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of theCourt by Mr. Henley C. Booth for the petitioner.

Murray C. Brady,
Petitioner,
298 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy L. Daily for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Andrew Flink,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Attilio Paladini et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the respondent.

James S. McCandless,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
United States Board of Tax Appeals.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords and Mr. Edwin C. Dutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Freddie Thomas,
Petitioner,
302 vs.
J. McD. Trimble, C. A. Braley, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude A. Miles and Mr. Creekmore Wallace for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. J. Flannelly and Mr. F. B. Burford for the respondents.

Furness, Withy & Company, Limited,
Petitioner,
303 vs.
Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey, Mr. Charles Henry Butler, Mr. Charles T. Cowenhoven, Jr., Mr. John A. Kratz, and Mr. Delbert M. Tibbetts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Thomas E. Rhodes, and Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for the respondents.

The United States, Petitioner,
304 vs.
Nevada County Narrow Gauge Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner, and by Mr. George H. Fernald, Jr., and Mr. Ben B. Cain for the respondent.

Thomas Carlo, Petitioner,
307 vs.
Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad Company.

The petition for a writof certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Thomas Hoffman for the petitioner, and by Mr. William A. Seifert for the respondent.

Cora A. Poindexter, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
308 vs.
Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick Henry Cullen and Mr. Thomas T. Fauntleroy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles A. Houts, Mr. H. M. Quigley, and Mr. S. W. Baxter for the respondent.

Bertha Wilson, as Administratrix of the Estate of Luther C. Wilson, deceased, Petitioner,
309 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick Henry Cullen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Harry R. Stocker for the respondent.

Illinois State Trust Company,
Petitioner,
310 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick Henry Cullen and Mr. Thomas T. Fauntleroy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Merrit U. Hayden for the respondent.

Indiana Quartered Oak Company,
Petitioner,
311 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. F. Granville Munson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Charles L. Douglas,
Petitioner,
312 vs.
The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Gibbons for the respondent.

Bank Line, Limited,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
Harry G. Porter, trading as H. & L. Chase et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Hickox, Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., and Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar, Mr. T. Catesby Jones, Mr. Henry H. Little, and Mr. Henry M. Longley for the respondents.

Aktieselskabet Dea,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Walter Wrightson, as managing owner of American Schooner, "Copperfield."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Griffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alex T. Howard for the respondent.

C. W. Trickett and Justus N. Baird, Petitioner,
316 vs.
The Kaw Valley Drainage District and The City of Kansas City, Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred Robertson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas A. Pollock and Mr. L. S. Harvey for the respondents.

The Citizens' Wholesale Supply Company, Petitioner,
317 vs.
The Welber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Simeon Nash for the petitioner, and by Mr. James I. Boulger for the respondent.

McPherson Brothers Company,
Petitioner,
318 vs.
Okanogan-Douglas Inter-County Bridge Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Peter McPherson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sam R. Sumner and Mr. John P. Hartman for the respondent.

George M. Emmanuel, Petitioner,
319 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. B. K. Pettingill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

American Baptist Home Mission Society, Petitioner,
320 vs.
Jackson Barnett, a Mental Incompetent, etc., and United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. P. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, Mr. Carroll G. Walter, and Mr. Almond D. Cochran for the respondent.

W. L. Slayton & Company of Toledo, Ohio, Petitioner,
323 vs.
Winston County, Alabama, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis R. Graham for the petitioner.

John S. Hunter, Petitioner,
324 vs.
Harry E. Baker, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey R. Spessard for the petitioner.

Pampanga Sugar Mills,
Petitioner,
325 vs.
Wenceslao Trinidad, as Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Quinton Paredes and Mr. Felipe Buencamino, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. John A. Hull for the respondent.

Harold E. Engemeon,
Petitioner,
326 vs.
Charles L. Rea et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Glendy B. Arnold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Xenophon P. Wilfley, Mr. Fred L. Williams, and Mr. Earl F. Nelson for the respondents.

Daniel A. Stapleton,
Petitioner,
327 vs.
Reading Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Ludlow for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach for the respondent.

J. A. Apple and Jake L. Hamon, Administrators, etc.,
Petitioners,
328 vs.
American National Bank of Ardmore, Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Potter for the petitioners, and by Mr. William B. Johnson for the respondent.

The Auxiliary Schooner "Mistinguette," her Engine, etc., Petitioner,
329 vs.
The United States of America.
416 Cases, G. T. Whiskey, etc., Petitioner,
330 vs.
The United States of America.
63 Kegs of Malt, containing approximately 16 Gallons each, etc., Petitioner,
331 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David V. Cahill and Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Arthur W. Henderson for the respondent.

Samuel C. Wetzler and Joseph B. Bloom, doing business as Blue Seal Chemical Company, Petitioners,
332 vs.
Edward R. Tolfree, doing business as "X" Laboratories.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Gwynn Gardiner for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederick P. Fish and Mr. Henry R. Ashton for the respondent.

Malissie B. Dawson, Administratrix, etc., Petitioners,
333 vs.
Reading Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Houston for the petitioner.

Northern Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
334 vs.
Alice Edith Schwartz.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Eldred Boland and Mr. Samuel Knight for the petitioner.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
335 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde A. DeWitt and Mr. E. Arthur Perkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. John A. Hull for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
336 vs.
Jacob Telfair Smith.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
337 vs.
Catz American Shipping Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parnum, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, and Mr. Arthur M. Boal for the petitioners, and by Mr. John C. Prizer for the respondent.

Gabriel Benitez,
Petitioner,
338 vs.
The People of the Philippine Islands.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gabriel Benitez, pro se, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. John A. Hull for the respondent.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
339 vs.
John Waid.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Strickling for the petitioner.

Jay A. Heidbrink and The Heidbrink Company, Petitioners,
340 vs.
Charles W. Hardiessen Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Whiteley for the petitioners, and by Mr. George E. Kirk for the respondent.

James R. Hatmaker, Petitioner,
341 vs.
The Dry Milk Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James R. Hatmaker, pro se, and by Mr. Hans V. Briesen for the respondent.

Great American Insurance Company, Petitioner,
342 vs.
Raymond W. Johnson and Noah S. Parks.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip P. Steptoe and Mr. Louis A. Johnson for the petitioner.

Clifton L. Richards, Petitioner,
343 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph A. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Montgomery Ward & Co., Incorporated, Petitioner,
345 vs.
Walter A. Gibbs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Wilson and Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. A. Howson and Mr. Hubert Howson for the respondent.

Cook-O'Brien Construction Company, Petitioner,
346 vs.
L. L. Crawford.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis H. Chalmers and Mr. Thomas G. Navin for the petitioner, and by Mr. James P. Lavin for the respondent.

John Martin Riehle, as Receiver in Equity of the Morosco Holding Company, Inc., Petitioner,
347 vs.
Edward Margolies.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry F. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nathan Burkan for the respondent.

Kate R. Bondurant et al.,
Petitioners,
348 vs.
Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York.

Kate R. Bondurant et al.,
Petitioners,
349 vs.
Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company of Springfield Massachusetts.

Kate R. Bondurant et al.,
Petitioners,
350 vs.
Lilburn Phelps, as Clerk, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. V. Gregory for the petitioners, and by Mr. Guston T. Fitzugh, Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondents.

National Surety Company of New York et al., Petitioners,
351 vs.
George Jarvis, Treasurer, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henderson Stockton and Mr. Thomas A. Flynn for the petitioners, and by Mr. Isaac Barth for the respondent.

Porto Rican American Tobacco Company of Porto Rico,
Petitioner,
353 vs.
Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Granville Meyers for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. John A. Hull for the respondent.

Augustine C. Sanford,
Petitioner,
354 vs.
American Seating Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. William E. Hamm for the respondent.

State of Missouri, at the relation and to the use of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
360 vs.
C. M. Danuser, J. T. Waddill, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Harry R. Stocker for the petitioner.

Shanker Laxman Gokhale,
Petitioner;
361 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Meyer Kraushaar, Mr. Emanuel Celler, and Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

State of Missouri, at the relation of Charles M. Hurst and C. J. Steffen,
Petitioner,
362 vs.
Charles H. Daues et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Hurst and Mr. C. H. Steffen pro se.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
363 vs.
Alfred Klesner, doing business, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

C. E. Hunn, Executor of the Estate of F. L. Miner, deceased, F. L. Townsend, et al., Petitioners,
365 vs.
E. A. Lewis et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irwin R. Blaisdell for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. H. Stipp for the respondent.

The Consolidation Coal Company, Inc., Petitioner,
366 vs.
Societa Commerciale di Navigazione, owner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., and Mr. Russell T. Mount for the petitioner, and by Mr. Floyd Hughes for the respondent.

Harry L. Reed, Petitioner,
367 vs.
Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Wilkinson and Mr. Huey P. Long for the petitioner, and by Mr. Elias Goldstein for the respondent.

St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railway Company, Petitioner,
368 vs.
William Van Loon.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Howell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney Thorne Able for the respondent.

Lancaster Iron Works, Inc., Petitioner,
369 vs.
J. C. Penney-Gwinn Corporation, et al.
Lancaster Iron Works, Inc., Petitioner,
370 vs.
J. C. Penney-Gwinn Corporation, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Stokes, Mr. Scott M. Loftin, and Mr. James E. Calkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. William E. Kay and Mr. Thomas B. Adams for the respondents.

The United States Printing and Lithograph Company, Petitioner,
372 vs.
Griggs, Cooper & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank F. Dinsmore and Mr. Walter P. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Orris P. Cobb for the respondent.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner,
373 vs.
J. E. Westover.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer Hall and Mr. N. S. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. H. Douglass for the respondent.

Warner Moore and Thomas L. Moore, copartners, etc., Petitioners,
374 vs.
The United States of America, as owner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira A. Campbell and Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parnum, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. Joseph Larocque for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
375 vs.
California Cooperative Canneries.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the respondent.

Paul C. Keyes, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
378 vs.
First National Bank of Aberdeen, South Dakota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles O. Bailey, Mr. John H. Voorhees, Mr. Theodore M. Bailey, and Mr. Ray F. Bruce for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Junell and Mr. Egbert S. Oakley for the respondent.

Daniel J. Shields, Petitioner,
379 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. M. Doyle and Mr. Frederick A. Thuee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Societa Nazionale di Navigazione, claimant, etc., Petitioner,
381 vs.
The Rheinstrom Brothers Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar R. Houston and Mr. Ezra G. Benedict/Fox for the respondent.

Humphreys Oil Company and The Pure Oil Company, Petitioners,
382 vs.
Joe Will Tatum and wife Lizzie Tatum, L. C. Puckett, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde A. Sweeton for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. D. Williamson for the respondents.

Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railway Company, Petitioner,
383 vs.
Aven H. Stierwalt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue and Mr. Alfred Evens for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.

William H. Haar, Petitioner,
384 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Lawrence, Mr. T. M. Cunningham, Jr., and Mr. P. P. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. White B. Miller, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
386 vs.
School District No. 1 of the City of Hayward, Wisconsin.

Petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis E. McGovern for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. T. Doar for the respondent.

E. Machlett & Son,
Petitioner,
387 vs.
Claude Neon Lights, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. E. Darby, Jr., and Mr. Dean S. Edmonds for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin J. Prindle, Mr. Thomas Ewing, and Mr. William Bohleber for the respondent.

Order of the United Commercial Travelers of America,
Petitioner,
388 vs.
Minnie Garbush.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. V. Rieke for the petitioner, and by Mr. George H. Sullivan for the respondent.

Bakelite Corporation,
Petitioner,
389 vs.
Frischer & Co., Inc., Randes Importing Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Customs Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert MacC. Barnes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Meyer Kraushaar for the respondents.

Henry Leroy Lewis,
Petitioner,
391 vs.
Lewis Jones, Administrator of the Estate of Tom Chapman, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Talley and Mr. David Meade White for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. S. P. Patteson for the respondent.

Anaconda Copper Mining Company,
Petitioner,
392 vs.
Carson Investment Company and John Henry Miller, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. L. O. Evans, Mr. Arthur A. Olson, and Mr. William Wallace, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank H. Hitchcock, Mr. George W. Wickersham, Mr. John H. Miller, and Mr. A. W. Boyken for the respondents.

I. H. Nakdimen,
Petitioner,
394 vs.
First National Bank and Merchants National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. McDonough for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Woods for the respondents.

Ruth B. DeHanas and Jesse L. DeHanas, Petitioners,
395 vs.
Cortez-King Brand Mines Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Howell for the petitioners.

Ernest A. Moross and Mary Kathryn Moross, Petitioners,
396 vs.
Hillsdale County, State of Michigan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Amariah F. Freeman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clare Retan for the respondent.

Michael Gillam, as Master and Claimant of Schooner "Vinces" and her cargo, Petitioner,
397 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank D. Moore and Mr. Carl E. Whitney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Arthur W. Henderson for the respondent.

Francis L. Klingle, Petitioner,
398 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harlan E. Leach for the petitioner.

Lau Ah Leong, Petitioner,
401 vs.
Fung Dai Kim Ah Leong.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Irwin, Mr. S. Hasket Derby, and Mr. A. G. M. Robertson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ira L. Ewers for the respondent.

Lottie C. Conklin, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
402 vs.
The United States of America and Sadie Mae Deavenport, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Sooy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondents.

W. R. Grace & Company, Petitioner,
404 vs.
New Orleans and South American Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ezra G. Benedict Fox and Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the respondent.

Edgar J. Phillips and Earl A. Darr, as executors, etc., Petitioners,
405 vs.
Edward E. Gnichtel, as Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earl A. Darr, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. S. Dee Hanson and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Sixto Talag, Petitioner,
406 vs.
C. E. Nathorst.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jose Abad Santos for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. John A. Hull for the respondent.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
407 vs.
Old Colony Railroad.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the petitioner, and by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, and Mr. Kingman Brewster for the respondent.

Stanley's Incorporated Store No. Three, Petitioner,
410 vs.
H. R. Earl, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Aubrey Lawrence for the petitioner.

Joseph Chernik, Petitioner,
412 vs.
Clyde Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Townsend England for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray Rood Allen for the respondent.

W. R. Freeman and C. Boettcher, as Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
413 vs.
Bonnie E. Frasher, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Milton Smith, Mr. Elmer L. Brock, and Mr. E. R. Campbell for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. J. Laton for the respondent.

The United States of America, ex rel. Niels Peter Claussen, Petitioner,
416 vs.
Hon. Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas B. Axtell and Mr. Charles A. Ellis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Glenn Stineman, Petitioner,
417 vs.
Peninsula State Steamship Corporation, as owner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob Louis Morewitz for the petitioner.

Freda Bergeron, Petitioner,
418 vs.
The Travelers Insurance Company of Hartford, Conn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Karl J. Knoepfler for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. A. C. Kennedy for the respondent.

Federal Telephone & Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
421 vs.
Caroline Wilks, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Erie, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Welles V. Moot for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ernest W. McIntyre for the respondent.

Simon F. Williams, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
427 vs.
Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company.
Simon F. Williams, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
428 vs.
Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Bedell and Mr. Isaac A. Stewart for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. O. Knight, Mr. C. Alfred Thompson, Mr. A. G. Turner, and Mr. James F. Glen for the respondent.

B. E. Quinn, Petitioner,
447 vs.
Rozina P. Davis, et vir.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Austin Barnes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Will E. Orgain for the respondents.

The Chief Justice announced the following order:

It will have been noted that since the close of last term there have been filed petitions for certiorari to the number of 244. This has thrown something of a burden upon the court, an anticipated result of the act of February 13, 1925, in the orderly accomplishment of its purpose. The members of the Court have therefore during the vacation, as opportunity offered, devoted much time to the consideration of the records and briefs filed with these petitions in order that they may be disposed of in the early days of this term.

It was the purpose of the Court to hear one case—the Gilchrist 5-cent fare case—from New York City, to-day and to-morrow, and to devote the rest of the week to conference upon the certioraris. By reason of the illness of counsel, the Gilchrist case has now been postponed for two weeks. This leaves open to us, after we have, in accordance with custom, paid the respects of the Court to the President of the United States, the entire week for the consideration of the pending petitions for certiorari, and will enable us on each of the next four Mondays to dispose of these petitions by granting or rejecting them.

The Court will now adjourn until Monday, October 8, to begin the hearing of cases set for that day, and the regular calendar following.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse P. Crawford, It is ordered that Roland Beesey, Esquire, of San Francisco, State California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Gerard Brandon, Esquire, of Natchez, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer C. Sharp, It is ordered that Rufus Creekmore, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Wilkes, It is ordered that Henry A. Schweinhaut, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Neville, It is ordered that Victor W. Gilbert, Esquire, of Meridian, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Morton P. Fisher, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Matthews, It is ordered that Stuart Arthur Culbertson, Esquire, of Meadville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that C. F. Miller, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Leigh L. Nettleton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris , It is ordered that Theodore B. Chancellor, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. S. Webb, It is ordered that Reginald L. Vaughan, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl I. Wheat, It is ordered that Herman Mohr, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It isordered that Woodward M. Taylor, Esquire, of Los Angeles, States of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that John W. Eggleston, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Balzer, It is ordered that Robert W. Brown, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Austin F. Canfield, It is ordered that Jerome Walsh, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin G. Davis, It is ordered that William Otis Russell, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Wills, It is ordered that C. R. Lipscomb, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Owen J. Roberts, It is ordered that Charles H. Sachs, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex Parte:
The Bakelite Corporation,
Petitioner.
17, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of prohibition herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. It is further ordered that a rule issue to the Presiding Judge and Associate Judges of the United States Court of Customs Appeals, directing them to show cause, returnable October 29, 1928, why a writ of prohibition should not issue out of this Court to prohibit them from entertaining the appeal, filed with them, from the findings and recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission in a cause entitled In the Matter of the Investigation of alleged unfair methods of competition and unfair acts in the importation and sale of Synthetic Phenolic Resin, Form C, and articles made wholly or in part thereof. Frischer & Co., Inc., Randes Importing Company, Transatlantic Clock & Watch Company, Inc., Western Briar Pipe Company, National Council of Importers & Traders, Inc., Apellants; Bakelite Corporation, Abse Brothers, Embed Art Corporation, Kaufmann Bros. & Bondy, Reiss-Premier Pipe Co., S. M. Frank & Co., Inc., Wm. Demuth & Co., L. & H. Stern, Inc., appellees; and why they should not cancel and annul the so-called judgment order entered by them in said cause on May 25, 1928, denying a motion to dismiss the appeal therein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte:
In the Matter of The Public National Bank of New York, Petitioner.
16 Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. It is further ordered that a rule issue to the Honorable Learned Hand and the Honorable Augustus N. Hand, United States Circuit Judges, and the Honorable William Bondy, District Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, directing them to show cause, returnable October 29, 1928, why a writ of mandamus should not issue out of this Court requiring them to reconvene as a statutory court of three judges, as provided by Section 266 of the Judicial Code (Se. 380, Title 28, of the United States Code), for the final hearing and determination of the cause entitled The Public National Bank of New York vs. Andrew B. Keating, as Receiver of Taxes of the City of New York, and William Reid, Jr., as City Collector, pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, in Equity, and why the petitioner herein should not have such other and further relief in the premises as may be just.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
46 vs.
The Cambridge Loan and Building Company.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings, It is now here ordered by this Court that further consideration of the motion be postponed until the hearing of the case on its merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isom Grayson, Micey Keys, Paulina Carolina, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
116 vs.
James A. Harris, William H. Harris, James H. Kennedy, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isom Grayson, Micey Keys, Paulina Carolina, et al.,
Petitioners,
116 vs.
James A. Harris, William H. Harris, James H. Kennedy, et al.

Order allowing Certiorari.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein the the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Norman Breaux Lumber Company,
Plaintiff in error and Appellant,
295 vs.
W. H. Reed, Tax Collector of Adams County, Mississippi, and his successor in office.

In error to and appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error and appeal in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Firemens' Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, Appellant,
376 vs.
James A. Beha, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jorgensen-Bennett Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
230 vs.
Will S. Knight, Sheriff, W. J. Hall, Commissioner Excise Tax Division, etc.

On consideration of the motion to substitute a stipulated record in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lee Hawkins, Petitioner,
284 vs.
F. P. Pulley and C. L. Davis, Trustees.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lee Hawkins, Petitioner,
284 vs.
F. P. Pulley and C. L. Davis, Trustees.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mrs. Wid. Wilfred Guillot,
Plaintiff in error and appellant,
380 vs.
Louisiana Railway and Navigation Co.

In error to and appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error and appeal in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Wid. Wilfred Guillot,
Plaintiff in error and appellant,
380 vs.
Louisiana Railway and Navigation Co.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Wid. Wilfred Guillot,
Petitioner,
380 vs.
Louisiana Railway and Navigation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gladys Anderson and her husband Chet Anderson, Petitioners, 390 vs. McGill Club.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gladys Anderson and her husband Chet Anderson, Petitioners, 390 vs. McGill Club.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, 133 vs. Tobe Stapleton, by his statutory guardian, Marion Stapleton.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rice and Adams Corporation,
Petitioner,
155 vs.
Harry D. Lathrop.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
J. E. Kirk.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Spokane and County of Whitman, Washington,
Petitioners,
164 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Leonard,
Petitioner,
183 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
195 vs.
Oscar Edwin Ferdinand Persson.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
196 vs.
Marco Nicolich.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Roxburghe,

Petitioner,

121 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dollar Steamship Line, owner of the S. S. "Melville Dollar,"

Petitioner,

122 vs.

Matson Navigation Co., owner of the S. S. "Mauna Ala."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Victor-American Fuel Company,

Petitioner,

123 vs.

Huerfano Agency Company, The Brennan Coal Mining Co., The Turner Coal Mining Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ben S. Thurlow, Mary Thurlow,
Ralph Thurlow, et al.,
Petitioners,
124 vs.
Waite Phillips Company, Independent Oil & Gas Company and the Marland Company of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. P. Douthit,
Petitioner,
125 vs.
Waite Phillips Company, Independent Oil & Gas Co. and the Marland Company of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ike E. Nelson, Hattie Nelson, R. O. Nelson, et al., Petitioners,
126 vs.
Waite Phillips Company, Independent Oil & Gas Company and The Marland Company of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Grattan D. Phillips, Jr.,

Petitioner,

127 vs.

Margaret A. Phillips, Individually and as Administratrix of the Estate of Grattan D. Phillips, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sanitary Refrigerator Co.,

Petitioner,

128 vs.

Alexander F. Winters and Basil C. Crampton.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Henderson,

Petitioner,

134 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writof certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abe Washington,
Petitioner,
136 vs.
The State of Florida.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York on the relation of Thomas H. Hayes, Petitioner,
137 vs.
George V. McLaughlin, as Police Commissioner of the City of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Zemurray,
Petitioner,
138 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mellie Bartlett Chase, Petitioner, vs. Charles W. Bartlett, Guardian. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

139

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

California Wine Association of New York, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

140

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Irving, Petitioner, vs. Alexander Barker. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

141

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Belt Railway Company of Chicago, Petitioner,
142 vs.
Ola Pfeifer, Administratrix of the Estate of Clyde E. Pfeifer, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Hewes and Frank W. Potter, Petitioners,
143 vs.
S. Deiches & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alex Mudd, Petitioner,
144 vs.
Samuel A. Perry, Charles B. Rogers and Jasper S. Martin, Administrator, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert F. Laugharn, as Trustee in
Bankruptcy of Dan Chandler, a bankrupt,
Petitioner,
145 vs.
Celia Chandler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Union Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
146 vs.
Frank K. Bowers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tyler County, Texas, G. C. Bradfield,
County Judge, E. H. McDonald, et al.,
Petitioners,
149 vs.
F. P. Town.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cudahy Packing Company,

Petitioner,

150 vs.

City of Omaha and Metropolitan Utilities District, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals forthe Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lydia M. Green, individually and as Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of Thomas F. Green, deceased,

Petitioner,

152 vs.

Victor Talking Machine Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Pick & Co.,

Petitioner,

153 vs.

W. K. Holt, J. B. McCoy and David A. Rendleman, Trustees, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Roberta T. Lyon,

Petitioner,

154 vs.

The Travellers' Protective Association of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Surety Company of New York,

Petitioner,

156 vs.

Cove Irrigation District.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nevada-California-Oregon Railway Company, Petitioner,

158 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Petitioner,
162 vs.
William Blankenhorn, Ford Motor Co., Joseph L. Sarto, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harold F. Reed, Petitioner,
163 vs.
National Surety Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The District of Columbia, Petitioner,
167 vs.
Oscar Wilkinson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Brady and Arthur J. Baxter, Petitioners,
168 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul Cappa, Petitioner,
170 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Capital Traction Company, Petitioner,
171 vs.
Alvin L. Newmyer, administrator of the Estate of Mabel P. Sneed, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kate W. Rosenberger,

Petitioner,

172 vs.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fourth and Central Trust Company, Sole Surviving Executor of the Estate of James E. Mooney, deceased,

Petitioner,

175 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abraham P. Waxman,

Petitioner,

176 vs.

Channing Pollock, Edgar Selwyn and Arch Selwyn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Surety Company of Des Moines, Petitioner,
177 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel.
James A. Jordan, Petitioner,
180 vs.
John H. Glass, United States Marshal, Middle District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel.
Jacob Mayer, Petitioner,
188 vs.
John H. Glass, United States Marshal, Middle District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America
ex rel. William A. Quinn,

Petitioner,

202 vs.

John H. Glass, United States Marshal, Middle District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America
ex rel. William V. Loughran,

Petitioner,

206 vs.

John H. Glass, United States Marshal, Middle District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America ex rel.
Lester Lord, Jr.,

Petitioner,

207 vs.

John H. Glass, United States Marshal, Middle District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to

Jacob Schliff and Abraham Schliff,
copartners doing business under the
firm name and style of Schliff Bros., Petitioners,
181 vs.
Eagle and Star British Dominions
Insurance Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
184 vs.
Industrial Commission of Utah and
Joseph Surrage.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

K. C. Lee and Chew Pook Gum,
Petitioners,
185 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Kuhn,
Petitioner,
199 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leong Duck,
Petitioner,
359 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. Hogan & Sons, Inc., Petitioner,
187 vs.
L. Boyers' Sons Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. Boyers' Sons Company, Petitioner,
217 vs.
T. Hogan & Sons, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul T. McFarland, as County Treasurer of Shawnee County, Kansas, and The Board of County Commissioners of Shawnee County, Kansas, petitioners,
189 vs.
The Central National Bank of Topeka, Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On considerationof the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chin Thyn,
Petitioner,
190 vs.
Victor Loisel, U. S. Marshal.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph U. Barnes,
Petitioner,
191 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Delaware, Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
192 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

School District of Tinicum Township, Pennsylvania,

Petitioner,

193 vs.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. M. Salisbury,

Petitioner,

197 vs.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur J. Karnuth, United States Director of Immigration and Charles Dreher, Inspector in Charge United States Immigration Service,

Petitioners,

198 vs.

United States of America, on the petition of Preston M. Albro, an Attorney for Mary Cook and Antonio Danelon.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. LeCrone, Receiver,
Petitioner,
200 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Fire Insurance Company of the City of New York,
Petitioner,
201 vs.
Joseph B. Sullivan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

U. S. Industrial Chemical Co., Inc., and Sterno Corporation, Petitioners, 204 vs. The Theroz Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oregon ex rel. I. H. Van Winkle, Attorney General, Petitioner, 211 vs. John C. Siegmund, County Judge, substituted for J. T. Hunt, James Smith, et al., etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leo J. Wallenstein and Paul Comora, Petitioner, 212 vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Steidle, as Administrator of
the goods, chattels, rights and
credits which were of Lewis J.
Steidle, deceased, Petitioners,
213 vs.
Reading Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. W. Mattheissen, Jr.,
Petitioner,
214 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James A. Sackley Company,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. B. Cottrell & Sons Co., Petitioner, vs. Claybourn Process Corporation. 216

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sol Rubin, Petitioner, vs. Samuel Midlinsky. 218

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Eccles & Company, Petitioner, vs. Strachan Shipping Company. 221

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pan American Petroleum & Transport Company, Petitioner,
222 vs.
Steamship "Virginia" Texas Steamship Co., Steamship "S. M. Spalding", et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Washington and Old Dominion Railway, a Corporation, Petitioner,
223 vs.
Arthur W. McPherson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Oklahoma Railways, Guy Patten and M. E. Gaskill, Petitioners,
224 vs.
Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered bythis Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Surety Company of New York
and Fidelity & Deposit Company of
Maryland, Petitioners,
351 vs.
George Jarvis, Treasurer of the County
of Apache, State of Arizona, etc.

The brief of counsel for the respondent in this case contains language of which complaint is made by opposing counsel for the petitioner. The brief for the respondent betrayed great impatience at the language and claims of the petitioner's brief, and urged penalty for delay thereby caused. An examination of petitioner's brief shows no words like those complained of, and yet the respondent characterizes them most severely. Because no page references are made by respondent's counsel to the record in accord with the rules, to sustain his criticism, and because the brief of petitioner complained of does not contain the words criticized, we deem it proper to animadvert upon the bad temper and recklessness of respondent's counsel in making such unsupported statements. We must insist that arguments in this Court, either oral or written, though often properly in sharp controversy, shall be gracious and respectful to both the Court and opposing counsel, and be in such words as may be properly addressed by one gentleman to another.

The brief of respondent in this case is ordered to be stricken from the files as not printed in accordance with the rules, and also for the reasons stated.

Suggestion has been made that there should be issued against the author of the offending brief in this case a rule to show cause why he should not be committed for contempt, but it is thought that this expression of the Court will be sufficient to prevent recurrence.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Surety Company of New York
and Fidelity & Deposit Company of
Maryland, Petitioners,
351 vs.
George Jarvis, Treasurer of the County
of Apache, State of Arizona, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Surplus Trading Company,
Plaintiff in error,
33 vs.
J. M. Haynie, as Sheriff, etc.

The motion to amend the record in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom Poe for the defendant in error.

Louis K. Liggett Company,
Appellant,
34 vs.
The Honorable Thomas J. Baldrige, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. C. C. Carlin in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Sol M. Stroock, as amicus curiae, in this case.

Federal Telephone & Telegraph Company, Petitioner,
421 vs.
Caroline Wilks, as Administratrix, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Colquitt in behalf of Mr. Welles V. Moot for the petitioner, leave was granted to file a reply brief for the petitioner within two days.

Louis K. Liggett Company,
Appellant,
34 vs.
The Honorable Thomas J. Baldrige, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles H. Sachs in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Charles H. Sachs and Louis Kaplan for the May Drug Company, as amicus Curiae, in this case.

Report of the Clerk of action taken pursuant to the order of the Court of February 20, 1928, with respect to the funds on hand representing balances due litigants in cases decided prior to October term, 1922, submitted by the Clerk and ordered to be filed.

Surplus Trading Company,
Plaintiff in error,
33 vs.
J. M. Haynie, as Sheriff, etc.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Applegate, Mr. Sam T. Poe, and Mr. Tom Poe for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. C. B. Rose, Mr. D. H. Cantrell, Mr. J. H. Loughborough, Mr. A. W. Dobyns, and Mr. A. F. House, for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

The People of the State of California,
Appellant,
241 vs.
William M. Mouse.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. A. Oyster and W. A. Watson, partners, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
253 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Bricker for the plaintiffs in error.

Ivy L. Leonard and Thomas B. Leonard, copartners, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
260 vs.
Swepson Earle, Conservation Commissioner, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Rawls for the plaintiffs in error and appellants.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, et al., Appellants, 273 vs. The United States of America et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herman Phleger and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellants.
George J. J. Mackay, Plaintiff in error, 274 vs. The State of Ohio.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George J. J. Mackay, pro se.
The Cudahy Packing Company, a corporation, Appellant, 278 vs. Jay Grant Hinkle, Secretary, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. Thomas M. Askren, and Mr. Edward B. Palmer for the appellant.
Wm. O. Bohnefeld, Plaintiff in error and appellant, 279 vs. Security National Bank.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Wilson and Mr. J. M. Springer for the plaintiff in error and appellant.
James R. Nelson and Clyde Randolph, doing business, etc., Plaintiffs in error, 296 vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky, by Milton Board, Revenue Agent, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles K. Wheeler for the plaintiffs in error.

The United States of America, Appellant, 305 vs. Fruit Growers Express Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the appellant.
Carson Petroleum Company, Plaintiff in error and appellant, 306 vs. Leon C. Vial, Sheriff, etc., et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Leahy for the plaintiff in error and appellant.
M. B. Carris Properties, Inc., and W. L. Shoemaker, Appellants, 313 vs. John W. Martin, as Governor, et al. the appellees in opposition thereto.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Pierce for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Fred H. Davis for
Leon Sampere, Plaintiff in error, and appellant, 321 vs. The City of New Orleans.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Winans Wall for the plaintiff in error and appellant.
John A. McKay, Appellant, 322 vs. Hector McInnes, Stuart Jenks, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul B. Cromelin and Bolitha J. Laws for the appellant.

Abraham Braunstein,
Plaintiff in error and appellant,
352 vs.
The People of the State of New York on the complaint of Gertrude E. McCarthy.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jay Leo Rothschild for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Era W. Moore (formerly Era W. Cobb), joined by her husband, C. G. Moore, A. M. Green, et al., Appellants,
385 vs.
A. H. Downing, Tax Collector, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Walter Cooke for the appellants.

Charles Noyes and Joe Babb,
Petitioners,
409 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. R. Mason for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

American Surety Company of New York,
Petitioner,
411 vs.
James A. Dick Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis C. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. J. Roberts for the respondent.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
414 vs.
Aaron A. B. Chatters.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry McCall, Mr. A. M. Warren, Mr. George Denegre, Mr. Victor Leovy, Mr. Henry H. Chaffe, and Mr. Jas. H. Bruns for the petitioner.

Southern Railway Company et al., Petitioners,
415 vs.
Aaron A. B. Chatters.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, Mr. Monte M. Lemann, Mr. Walter J. Suthon, Jr., Mr. L. E. Jeffries, and Mr. S. R. Prince for the petitioners.

George E. Mayer, Petitioner,
419 vs.
Central Vermont Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Koch for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Redmond for the respondent.

Patrick F. Ryan, as Administrator of the Estate of William J. Smith, deceased, et al., Petitioners,
420 vs.
John M. Cormany, et al., as heirs, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Fowler and Mr. Malcolm McDermott for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert Burrow for the respondents.

Mar Fow Lun,
Petitioner,
425 vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Leonard Goodwin Husar,
Petitioner,
434 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Milton T. U'Ren and Mr. Leo R. Friedman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Emil W. Schmutz,
Petitioner,
435 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. The Chicago Bar Association.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Morse Ives for the respondent.

The Texas Company,
Petitioner,
443 vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Livingston Gifford for the petitioner, and by Mr. John E. Green, Jr., Mr. Melville Church, and Mr. Alfred M. Houghton for the respondent.

J. E. Ratliffe, L. Siess, R. D. McMahon, et al., Petitioners,
445 vs.
Joe E. Meyers, Unity Oil Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Gordon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wille E. Orgain and Mr. Beeman Strong for the respondents.

George W. Heintz and American Electric Racing Association, Inc., Petitioners,
449 vs.
Owen P. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Bakewell for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the respondent.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
455 vs.
Edward H. Johnson.
New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
456 vs.
Myrtle J. Johnson.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney C. Murray and Mr. Albert S. Marley for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Atwood and Mr. Oscar S. Hill for the respondents.

The State of Louisiana, Complainant,
9, Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. Gerald Brandon for the complainant. Argument suspended. The case to be referred to a special master to be appointed by the Court.

Louis K. Liggett Company, Appellant, 34 vs. The Honorable Thomas J. Baldrige, Attorney General, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Owen J. Roberts and Mr. Roy M. Sterne for the appellant, and by Mr. Paul C. Wagner for the appellee.
J. Smylie Herkness, Appellant, 3 vs. Valentine K. Irion, Commissioner, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellant, and submitted by Mr. Percy Saint for the appellees.
Standard Pipe Line Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners, 11 vs. Commissioners of Index Sulphur Drainage District.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William H. Arnold for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard M. Long, It is ordered that Everett Brown, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chas. V. Imlay, It is ordered that Franklin P. Jackson, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul F. Myers, It is ordered that Bruno V. Bitker, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Surplus Trading Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
33 vs.
J. M. Haynie, as Sheriff, etc.

On motion made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert B. Coguwell, leave was granted to file a brief of the plaintiff in error in opposition to the motion to amend the record in this case within ten days.

Standard Pipe Line Co., Inc., et al., Petitioners,
11 vs.
Commissioners of Index Sulphur Drainage District.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Henry Moore, Jr., for the respondents. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Frank C. Jordan, Secretary of State, and Robert V. Jordan, Deputy Secretary, etc., Plaintiffs in error and petitioners,
13 vs.
K. Tashiro, M.D., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. U. S. Webb for the plaintiffs in error and petitioners. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Elizabeth C. Taft,
Petitioner,
16 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.
Gilbert C. Greenway, Jr.,
Petitioner,
17 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The reargument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Henry W. Taft for the petitioners in No. 16, continued by Mr. M. C. Davis for the respondents, and by Mr. Henry W. Taft for the petitioner in No. 16, and concluded by Mr. Hiram C. Todd for the petitioner in No. 17.

Morimura, Arai & Co.,

Petitioner,

18 vs.

Nathan Taback et al.

This case was argued by Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic M. P. Pearse for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Hobart, It is ordered that Duane Elmer Minard, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey; Edward Pokorny and John Edward Pokorny, Esquires, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that Emanuel van Dernoot, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Samuel A. Wright and Anton C. Van Scelen, Esquires, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theo. A. Mostetler, It is ordered that O. B. Buchanan, Esquire, of Wilkinsburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Utah.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Harvey C. Cluff for the defendant, leave was granted to file answer of the defendant herein.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Ry. Co., Plaintiff in error,
20 vs.
August E. Holmberg.

This case was argued by Mr. Wymer Dressler for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. O. S. Spillman and Mr. Hugh La Master for the defendant in error.

Charles Warner Co.,
Petitioner,
22 vs.
Independent Pier Co.
Charles Warner Co.,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
Steamship "Gulftrade," whereof Gulf Refining Co. is claimant.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. E. H. Brown, Jr., for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent in No. 23, and by Mr. Howard M. Long for the respondent in No. 22, and concluded by Mr. E. H. Brown, Jr., for the petitioners.

Lehigh Valley R. R. Co.,
Appellant,
24 vs.
Board of Public Utility Commissioners et al.
Lehigh Valley R. R. Co.,
Appellant,
54 vs.
Board of Public Utility Commissioners et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Vail E. Purdy, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Kramer, It is ordered that Harold G. Baker and Ralph F. Lesemann, Esquires, of East St. Louis, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that John R. Brecking, Esquire, of Hutchinson, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Lehigh Valley R. R. Co., Appellant, 24 vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners, Joseph Autenrieth, et al., etc. Lehigh Valley R. R. Co., Appellant, 54 vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners et al.	The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Duane E. Minard and Mr. George S. Hobart for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. John O. Bigelow for the appellees.
Annie Marie Maney, Petitioner, 27 vs. The United States of America.	This case was argued by Mr. Bruno V. Bitker and Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.
Jackson & Eastern Railway Co., W. I. Luke and S. A. Neville, Plaintiffs in error, 28 vs. W. W. Burns, E. B. Nettleton, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George B. Neville for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument. Papers on writ of error to be treated as an application for certiorari.
The State of Washington on the Relation of Seattle Title Trust Co., as Trustee, etc., Plaintiffs in error, 29 vs. George W. Roberge, as Superintendent, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Corwin S. Shank for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene R. West, It is ordered that Charles H. Segerstrom, Esquire, of Sonora, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Balzer, It is ordered that Michael J. Quan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chas. D. Hamel, It is ordered that Mortimer Levitan, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chas. D. Mamel, It is ordered that Chas. B. Quarles, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira L. Ewers, It is ordered that Irving F. Wixon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Washington on the relation of Seattle Title Trust Co., as Trustee, etc.,
Plaintiff in error,
29 vs.
George W. Roberge, as Superintendent of Building of the City of Seattle.

Argument continued by Mr. Corwin S. Shank for the plaintiff in error, by Mr. A. C. Van Soelen for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Corwin S. Shank for the plaintiff in error.

The Consolidated Flour Mills Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
30 vs.
A. Muegge, M. F. Porter, and D. N. Porter.

This case was argued by Mr. E. R. Colladay for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Lunsford L. Hamner for the defendants in error.

Security Mortgage Co.,
Petitioner,
32 vs.
Charles A. Powers, Trustee, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. John E. Benton for the petitioner and by Mr. Walter S. Dillon for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry C. Robb, It is ordered that J. Calvin Brown, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motinn first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. L. Hill, It is ordered that Edward Walbridge, Esquire,of Miami, State of Florida, and Louis Cassinsky, Esquire, of Daytona Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Wickersham, It is ordered that Wm. Dean Embree, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, and Walter Burgwyn Jones, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. W. Millan, It is ordered that James P. Plunkett, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash It is ordered that Paul M. Bach, Esquire, of Eau Claire, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Donald H. McLean, It is ordered that Sigurd A. Emerson and Michael H. Feldman; Esquires, of Elizabeth, State of New Jersey, and James I. Bowers, Esquire, of Somerville, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis A. Johnson, It is ordered that James A. Meredith, Esquire, of Fairmont, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. L. Ransom, It is ordered that Truman R. Hawley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Braden Vandeventer, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elwood H. Seal, It is ordered that Hans Hanson, Esquire, of Black River Falls, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Foster-Fountain Packing Company, Inc., and Sea Food Company,
Appellants,
68 vs.
E. J. Haydel, Fred Schouest, L. R. Cabriac, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

L. O. Johnson, Jr., and Sea Food Company, Tanas Hebert, et al.,
Appellants,
69 vs.
E. J. Haydel, Fred Schouest, L. R. Cabriac, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, the same is

hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

O R D E R

The Court has considered the report of the Clerk respecting the action taken under its order of February 20, 1928, relating to the balances in his hands aggregating $7,403.49 and composed of monies paid in to meet anticipated costs in cases which, although pending when the payments were made, were finally disposed of before the opening of the October term, 1922;

And it appearing that the Clerk forthwith after the making of that order gave public notice by publication, as directed therein, to the effect that all persons claiming to be entitled to any part of such monies were required to present their claims on or before the 15th day of May, 1928, and that all such monies to which no valid claim was presented before that date would be disposed of as provided in such order;

And it appearing that after the making of the order of February 20, 1928, the Clerk ascertained and found the true claimants to items aggregating $1,914.58 of the monies described in such order and duly paid the same to such claimants as shown in his report;

And it appearing, as shown in the Clerk's report, that two further items of such monies—that is to say, an item of $381.80 in the case of State of Louisiana v. State of Mississippi, No. 11, original, October term, 1905, and an item of $2,612.26 in the case of State of North Carolina v. State of Tennessee, No. 4, original, October term, 1916—are in a situation which may enable the Clerk, if given further time, to pay the same to the true claimants;

And it appearing that apart from the two items last above specified there remains in the clerk's hands an aggregate of $2,494.85 of the monies described in such re ort, that no claim to any part of this sum has been made or asserted pursuant to such order and that the clerk, although making diligent effort to ascertain and find the true claimants to the same, has been unable to ascertain and find any claimants thereto;

It is therefore considered and ordered by the Court:

1. The payment by the Clerk to various claimants of items aggregating $1,914.58 is approved and the Clerk shall have credit accordingly in his accounts.

2. The Clerk shall retain for the time being the two items of $381.80 and $2,612.26 before specified and shall continue his efforts looking to the ultimate payment of these items to the rightful claimants. A further report on these two items shall be made by the Clerk before the close of the present term.

3. The Clerk is directed to pay the sum of $2,494.85, being the aggregate of unclaimed items, into the Treasury of the United States, to be there held and disposed of as is now or may be hereafter provided by law. Such payment into the Treasury shall be accompanied by a certified copy of the order of February 20, 1928, of the Clerk's report thereunder, and of this order; and when such payment is made the Clerk shall be entitled to credit accordingly in his accounts.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Which report is in the words and figures following, viz:

To the Honorable,

The Supreme Court of the United States.

Report of the Clerk of Action Under the Court's

Order of February 20, 1928.

With reference to the accumulated fund in my hands, representing balances due litigants in cases decided prior to the October Term, 1922, and covered by order of the Court dated February 20, 1928, I beg to report that notice of the order was given by publication, under dates of March 9, 16, and 23, 1928, respectively, in four newspapers to-wit: The Washington Evening Star, The New Orleans Times-Picayune, The Kansas City Star and The San Francisco Examiner.

The amount in my hands covered by the order and advertisement was $7,403.49.

Of the total fund $2994.06 represents amounts due in two Original Cases:

State of Louisiana vs. State of Mississippi, No. 11 Original, October Term, 1905 (Amount due State of Louisiana) . . . . .$ 381.80

State of North Carolina vs. State of Tennessee, No. 4 Original, October Term, 1916(Balance due State of North Carolina). . . 2612.26

Total 2994.06

As to these two items, I am unable, at the present time, to make a final report by reason of non-payment of costs therein, due from the States of Mississippi and Tennessee respectively. The cases and amounts due have been called to the attention of the two debtor States, and I am advised that steps are being taken by those States with a view to settlement. This settlement undoubtedly will take some time, and I therefore recommendthat action on the balances on hand in these two cases be passed for the time being.

No valid claim to any portion of the fund has been presented following publication of the order of the Court; but through persistent investigation by my office the parties properly entitled to payment in the following cases have been located, and by due payments to them the cases have been settled:

Central R. R. Co. of N. J. vs. Mills, No. 878, Oct. Term, 1884, (Paid to Central R. R. Co. of N. J. . . . . .$ 11.25

Ex Parte: Washington F. Lothrop, Petitioner, 6 Origl. Oct. Term, 1885) Paid Judd & Detweiler, Inc. account printing) 3.00

Greene County, Mo. vs. Huidekoper, No. 85 Oct. Term, 1885.(paid to Greene County,Mo.) 83.55

Bloxham, Governor of Florida vs. Townsend, Adm'r., No. 1209, Oct. Term, 1885.(Paid to Comptroller of State of Florida) 160.55

The Choctaw Nation vs. The United States, No. 848, Oct. Term, 1886. (Paid to The Choctaw Nation) 4.10

Knox County, Mo. vs. Harshman, No. 1212, Oct. Term, 1889. (Paid to Knox County,Mo.) 90.30

Oregon Ry. & Navigation Co. vs. Oregonian Ry. Co., No. 335, Oct. Term, 1891. (Paid to Oregon Ry. & Navigation Co.) 2.85

Reagan, et al., Commissioners vs. Farmers Loan & Trust Co.)		$114.87
Reagan, et al., Commissioners vs. Merchants Trust Co., Nos. 928, 1167, 1168, 1169 and 1170, Oct. Term, 1893.(Paid to The State of Texas.)		91.75 77.12 79.87 88.50
Deno vs. Griffin, No. 3, Oct. Term, 1895. (Paid to Jackson H. Ralston, attorney)		18.90
Cincinnati, N. O. & Texas Pacific Ry. Co. vs. Interstate Commerce Commission, No. 394, Oct. Term, 1895. (Paid to C. N. O. & T. P. Ry. Co.)	$281.50	
Transferred from balance in above case to pay ½ costs in case between same parties, No. 473, Oct. Term, 1895	20.00	
		$301.50
State of South Carolina vs. Port Royal & Augusta Ry. Co., Nos. 292 & 323, Oct. Term, 1896. (Paid to Treasurer, State of South Carolina)	15.10 7.40	$ 22.50
Nordstrom vs. Moyer, et al., No. 359, Oct. Term, 1897. (Paid to J. Hamilton Lewis, att'y)		.86
Ex Parte: The Union Steamboat Co. 12 Orig1., Oct. Term, 1899, (Paid to Harvey D. Goulder, attorney)		5.25
State of Maryland vs. State of West Virginia, No. 1 Orig1., Oct. Term, 1911. (Paid to Treasurer, State of W. Va.)		757.86
	Total	$1914.58

The remainder of the fund in my hands, ($7403.49 less $2994.06 and $1914.58) amounting to $2494.85, represents balances due to claimants in the following cases, none of whom can be located and none of whom has appeared or asserted his claim as required by the order and advertisement:

NO.	October Term, 1883	
18,	Orig1. Ex Parte: John Johnson, Petitioner (Due petitioner)	$1.75
104	Ellis et al. vs. Davis.(Due att'y)	19.29
139	Robertson et al. vs. Pickrell, et al. (Due attorney)	20.00
152	Gilmer et al. vs. Higley, (Due plff. in error)	28.18
199	Thos. C. Baker, Treas'r. vs. U. S. ex rel. Davis. (Due plff. in error)	3.68
237	Waples vs. United States. (Due applt.)	4.48
248	Freedmans Sav. & Trust Co. vs. Earle. (Due att'y.)	20.00
262	Cooper, et al. vs. Schlesinger, et al. (Due att'y.)	20.00
529	Johnstone, et al. vs. Robinson Consol. Mining Co. (Due att'y.)	20.00

No:		
	October Term, 1883 - Cont'd.	
916	Slidell, et al. vs. Emler, et al. (Due appellants)	$ 6.85
917	" " vs. Tschirn (Due plff. in error)	10.35
966	District of Col. vs. Clephane (Due att'y.)	20.00
1235	Baldwin vs. County of Otoe (Due plff. in error)	73.73
	October Term, 1884	
109	Schnieder, et al. vs. Barney. (Due plff. in error)	33.21
118	Halferty vs. Wilmering (Due plff. in error)	60.84
119	Independent School Dist. etc., vs. Hall.(Due plff. in error)	5.72
136	Comm'rs. of Buncombe County, Fry. et al. vs. Tommey.(Due att'y.)	20.00
178	Sargent vs. Hall Safe & Lock Co. (Due applt.	.86
248	Richmond Mining Co. vs. Rose, et al.(Due att'y.)	9.23
269	Hadden,et al. vs. Merritt, Late Coll'r., etc., (Due plff. in error.)	20.68
413	Inbusch vs. Bailey, Maxwell & Miller(Due appt)	5.00
273	Grant vs. Parker (Due appt)	6.28
986	County of Sacramento vs. Central Pacific R.R.Co. (Due att'y.)	20.00
987	County of Sacramento vs. Central Pacific R.R. Co. (Due att'y.)	20.00
	October Term, 1885	
86	Coyle vs. Davis (Due plff. in error)	4.35
181	Thomas vs. Town of Lansing (Due plff. in error)	6.32
227	Hyatt vs. Southworth (Due applt. 22.30 Due att'y. 20.00	42.30
232	Graham, et al. vs. Boston & H. & Erie R. R. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
252	Evans vs. Pike, Widow, etc. (Due attorney)	20.00
289	Raleigh & Gaston R. R. Co. vs. Bd. of Comm'r. of Wake County (Due attorney)	18.15
464	County of Santa Clara vs. S. P. R. R. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
564	Deffebach vs. Hawke (Due attorney)	18.15
619	County of San Bernardino vs. S. P. R. R. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
620	People of California vs. Northern Ry. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
621	People of California vs. Central Pac. R. R. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
622	People of California vs. So. Pacific R. R. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00

NO:		
	October Term, 1885 Cont'd.	
1274	Sol. Star & Bullock vs. Warder, et al. (Due attorney)	$20.00
	October Term, 1886	
5 Origl.	Ex Parte: George Halston, Petitioner. (Due petitioner)	1.00
102	Sherman, Adm'r. vs. Jerome and Grant, Ex'rs. (Due deft. in error)	1.65
233	Bean and Alsop vs. Patterson (Due attorney)	20.00
262	Carpenter vs. Washington & Georgetown R. R. Co. (Due plff. in error)	.40
	October Term, 1887	
2 Origl.	Ex Part: Albert Grant, Petitioner. (Due petitioner)	.20
3 Origl.	State of Wisconsin vs. Pelican Ins. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
61	Shields, et al. vs. Shiff. (Due deft. in error)	2.05
132	Bucher vs. Cheshire R. R. Co. (Due plff. in error)	.65
180	United States vs. Beebe, et al. (Due applt)	.20
188	Walker, et al. vs. Dun, et al. (Due appellants)	.70
210	Peoria and Pekin Union Ry. Co. vs. Chicago Pekin & SW. R. R. Co. (Due appellant)	.65
587	Peoples Bank of City of N. Y. vs. Mechanics National Bank of Newark, N.J.(Due appellant)	7.55
660	People of California vs. Central Pac. Ry. Co. (Due Attorney)	20.00
661	" " " vs. Southern Pac. R. R. (Due attorney)	20.00
662	" " " vs. Northern Ry. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
663	" " " vs. Calif. Pacific R. R. (Due attorney)	20.00
664	" " " vs. Central Pac. R. R. (Due attorney)	20.00
716	Peoples Bank of City of N.Y. vs. Mechanics National Bank of Newark, N.J.(Due appellant)	10.45
1157	People of California vs. Central Pacific R. R. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
1420	Benson vs. McMahan, Marshal. (Due appellant)	.90

NO:			
		October Term, 1888	
4	Original	Ex Parte: Farmers Loan & Trust Co. Petitioner. (Due petitioner)	$ .80
5	Original	Ex parte: Hollen Parker, Petitioner. (Due respondent)	1.45
57		Marshall, et al., Adm'rs. vs. United States. (Due appellants)	6.40
115		Segrist, et al. vs. Crabtree (Due plff. in error)	.15
126		Kentucky Central R. R. Co. vs. County of Bourbon, Ky. (Due attorney)	20.00
185		Leonard, et al. vs. Ozark Land Co. (Due appellants)	4.65
192		La Mothe vs. Angus (Due appellant)	4.50
207		Hammer vs. Garfield Mining & Milling Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
236		Friedlander, et al. vs. Texas & Pacific Ry. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
260		Andrus vs. St. Louis Smelting & Refg. Co. (Due attorney)	20.00
266		Hawkins vs. Glenn, Trustee. (Due plff. in error)	.40
947		Nelson, et al. vs. Green & Bond, Trustees. (Due appellants)	106.95
1027		" " vs. Green & Bond, Trustees. (Due appellants)	124.65
1364		Wilde vs. Bircher, et al. (Due plff. in error)	11.65
		October Term, 1889	
14		Springfield, et al. vs. Thomas, (Due plff. in error)	24.15
19		Richardson and Day vs. Green & Bond, Trustees. (Due appellants)	23.45
147		Wheeler, et al. vs. Cloyd, et al. (Due appellant)	1.00
178		Batcheller & Co. vs. Adden, et al. (Due appellants)	9.55
215		Hill, Ex'r. vs. Merchants Mutual Ins. Co. (Due plff. in error)	1.00
226		Small vs. Northern Pacific R. R. Co. (Due appellant)	19.40
310		Rey. et al. vs. Steamboat "Eclipse", etc., (Due appellants)	6.20
952		Adams, Trustee vs. Conner, et al. (Due attorney)	20.00
1212		Knox County, Mo. vs. Harshman (Due attorney)	20.00
1617		Stevens Vs. Fuller (Due attorney)	20.00

NO:			
	October Term, 1890		
28	Ferguson, et al. vs. Dent, et al.	(Due appellants)	$ 8.45
253	Smale et al. vs. Mitchell	(Due plff. in error)	33.55
260	Leland vs. Central Nat'l. Bank of N.Y.	(Due plff. in error)	7.50
589	Sweetland vs. Blatchford, Surviving Ex'r.	(Due appellant)	7.65
	October Term, 1891		
16	Mccartney vs. Crittenden	(Due plff. in error)	47.55
18	Cooke vs. Globe File Co. et al.	(Due. appellant)	1.05
65	Kaukauana Water Power Co. vs. Green Bay & Mississippi Canal.	(Due plff. in error)	.70
106	Finn v. Brown, Receiver	(Due attorney)	20.00
120	City of Brenham vs. German American Bank	(Due plff. in error)	.20
139	Bird vs. Benlisa, Adm'r.	(Due plff. in error)	13.90
174	Berry vs. Wood	(Due plff. in error)	6.55
188	Lacassaque vs. Chapins, Ex'r.	(Due appellant)	8.65
1211	Lewis et al. vs. Barnhart, et al.	(Due attorney)	20.00
1212	" " vs. Phillips, et al.	(Due attorney)	20.00
1213	" " vs. Johnson, et al.	(Due attorney)	20.00
1214	" " vs. Dirks, et al.	(Due attorney)	20.00
1215	" " vs. Dye, et al.	(Due attorney)	20.00
1216	" " vs. Boner, et al.	(Due attorney)	20.00
1217	" " vs. Boner, et al.	(Due attorney)	20.00
1377 and 1378	Terry et al. vs. County of King.	(Due plff. in error)	24.30
	October Term, 1892		
9, Origl.	Ex Parte: Henry Morrison	(Due petitioner)	.35
20	Butler vs. Goreley, Assignee, etc.	(Due plff. in error)	1.15
174	East Tenn., Virginia & Ga. Ry. Co. vs. McKemy.	(Due plff. in error)	.80
1019	Donnelly vs. Douglass, et al.	(Due appellant)	3.80
1143	Kengla vs. Offutt	(Due plff. in error)	22.20

NO:		
	October Term, 1893	
107	Murphy vs. Packer (Due attorney)	$18.65
178	Dower, et al. vs. Richards, et al. Ex'rs. (Due attorney)	20.00
262	Trotter vs. Lowenstein & Bros. (Due appellant)	.05
345	Chicago Deposit Vault Co. vs. McNulta, Rec'r. (Due appellant)	.40
385	Lewis vs. Monson, Ex'r. (Due plff. in error.)	9.60
550	De Arnaud vs. United States (Due appellant)	8.40
1171	Franklin Sav. Bank vs. Taylor, et al. (Due appellants)	.95
	October Term, 1894	
9	Origl. Ex Parte: Lafayette Hudson, Petitioner, (Due petitioner)	7.90
57	State ex rel. Stanton, Trustee vs. Glover (Due attorney)	20.00
180	Evers, et al. vs. Watson, et al. (Due appellants)	13.65
201	Dubuque and Sioux City R. R. Co. vs. Snell. (Due plff. in error)	4.70
213	Royer vs. Schultz Belting Co. (Due plff. in error)	5.80
909	Moran, et al. vs. Hagerman, Adm'r. et al. (Due appellants)	.20
985	Maloy vs. Duden (Due appellant)	.45
	October Term, 1895	
6	Singer Mfg. Co. vs. June Mfg. Co. (Due appellant)	136.20
102	Pitts. vs. United States(Due plff. in error)	5.70
	October Term, 1896	
17	Henry vs. Alabama & Vicksburg R. R. Co. (Due appellant)	4.40
191	Dowell, et al. vs. Applegate, et al. (Due plffs. in error)	8.45
293	King, et al. vs. Port Royal & Augusta Ry. Co. (Due appellants)	16.85

NO:		
	October Term, 1897	
118	Rause, Receiver vs. Harry ($8.05 due plff. in error; $20.00 due attorney)	$ 28.05
119	Faxon, Jr., Trustee vs. United States. (Due appellant)	119.40
489	Ritchie vs. McMullen (Due petitioner)	9.05
514	Vance, et al. vs. Vandercook (Due appellants)	30.75
515	" " vs. " (" ")	30.85
	October Term, 1899	
4,	Original. Ex Parte: Jones Grossmayer (Due petitioner)	2.60
	October Term, 1900	
87	Thompson, et al. vs. Los Angeles Farming & Milling Co. (Due plffs. in error)	8.65
223	A. L. Gusman in behalf of Samuel Wright vs. Marrero, Sheriff. (Due attorney)	19.45
	October Term, 1901	
4	Compagnie Francaise de Navigation a Vapeur vs. State Bd. of Health of La. (Due attorney)	20.00
56	Board of County Comm'rs. of County of Lake, Colo. vs. Sutliff (Due attorney)	20.00
112	Dudley vs. Board of County Comm'rs. of County of Lake, Colo. (Due petitioner)	60.50
189	Lee Lung, etc., vs. Patterson, Collector (Due appellant)	24.65
664	Bragg, Special Adm'r. vs. Wright (Due appellant)	.20
	October Term, 1904	
513	Robinson & Watson, et al. vs. Wingate, County Judge, et al. (Due deft. in error)	6.25
	October Term, 1905	
4	Original. State of Mo. vs. State of Illinois. (Due attorney)	20.00
15	People of Illinois ex rel. Anderson vs. Vredenburg (Due plff. in error)	44.40
16	Continental Ins. Co. of Ill. vs. Vredenburg (Due plff. in error)	39.65

NO: October Term, 1910

983 Metropolitan Water Co. of W. Va. vs. Kaw Valley Drainage Dist. etc. (Due petitioner) $7.55

Total $2494.85

Notwithstanding diligent effort to identify and locate the parties entitled to the respective amounts in the cases last mentioned, it has been found impossible to make a refund.

I therefore recommend that this amount, $2494.85, be ordered paid into the Treasury, subject to the terms of the order of February 20, 1928.

(Signed) Charles Elmore Cropley
Clerk.

Sanitary Refrigerator Co., Petitioner,
128 vs.
Alexander F. Winters and Basil C. Crampton.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted. The order entered October 8, 1928, denying the petition for a writ of certiorari herein is revoked, and a writ of certiorari in this cause is granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sanitary Refrigerator Co., Petitioner,
128 vs.
Alexander F. Winters and Basil C. Crampton.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is futher ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New River Collieries Company, et al., Petitioners,
237 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. J. B. Ellis, Petitioner,
178 vs.
Associated Industries Insurance Corporation.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the Clerk have the record and petition printed forthwith and pay the costs thereof, as well as the costs already incurred herein, from the special fund in his custody as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Louisiana, Complainant,
9, Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

O R D E R

It is ordered that this case be referred to Thomas G. Haight as the special master, with directions and authority to report the same to the Court with his findings of fact, his conclusions of law, and his recommendations for a decree, all subject to examination, consideration, approval, modification, or other disposal by the Court.

The special master shall have authority to employ competent stenographic and clerical assistants, to fix the times and place of argument, to issue subpoenas to secure the attendance of witnesses, and to administer oaths when this may be necessary. When his report shall be completed the clerk of the Court shall cause the same to be printed, and when it is presented to the Court in printed form the parties shall be accorded a reasonable time to be fixed by the Court within which to present exceptions.

The special master shall be allowed his actual expenses and a reasonable compensation for his services to be fixed hereafter by the Court. The allowances to him, the compensation paid to his stenographic and clerical assistants, and the cost of printing his report shall be charged against and be borne by the parties in such proportion as the Court may hereafter direct. If the appointment herein made of a special master is not accepted, or if the place becomes vacant during the recess of the Court, the Chief Justice shall have authority to make a new designation, which shall have the same effect as if originally made by the Court herein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Pipe Line Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Commissioners of Index Sulphur Drainage District. On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Consolidated Flour Mills Company, Plaintiff in error, vs. A. Muegge, M. F. Porter, and D. M. Porter. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
225 vs.
Marcella Driggers, as Administratrix of William A. Driggers, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raul Rogerio Gonzalez, by his Guardian ad litem Adelaida Gonzalez, Petitioner,
226 vs.
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Western & Atlantic Railroad Petitioner,
234 vs.
Mrs. Nora E. Hughes, Administratrix of the Estate of Ira L. Hughes, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
238 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company,
Lessee of the Boston & Albany Railroad.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
304 vs.
Nevada County Narrow Gauge Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands,
Petitioner,
251 vs.
Warner, Barnes & Co., Ltd.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
252 vs.
J. M. Menzi.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Newell B. Wallace, Petitioner,
261 vs.
Motor Products Corporation, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ithaca Trust Company, Sole Surviving Executor & Trustee under the last will and Testament of Edwin C. Stewart, deceased, Petitioner,
267 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. A. Marshall & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
272 vs.
Steamship "President Arthur," her engines, boilers, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
290 vs.
William Henry Woolen.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew Flink,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Attilio Paladini, Hugo Paladini, Ercelia Paladini, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Douglas,
Petitioner,
312 vs.
The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Co.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.,
Petitioner,
414 vs.
Aaron A. B. Chatters.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
415 vs.
Aaron A. B. Chatters.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
455 vs.
Edward H. Johnson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. But the argument is to be limited to the question whether the alleged misconduct of counsel for the plaintiffs in their arguments to the jury was so unfairly prejudicial to the defendant as to justify a new trial.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
456 vs.
Myrtle J. Johnson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. But the argument is to be limited to the question whether the alleged misconduct of counsel for the plaintiffs in their arguments to the jury was so unfairly prejudicial to the defendant as to justify a new trial.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ballard & Ballard Co.,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
Munson Steamship Line.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert W. Johnson, Jr., John S. Johnson, and Evangeline B. Johnson,

Petitioners,

228 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Angelo Benese,

Petitioner,

229 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. B. Hord Grain Company,

Petitioner,

231 vs.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Mesce,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to

232 vs. the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Consolidated Gas Electric Light and

Power Company of Baltimore,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to

233 vs. the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hallie Burton and R. I. Burton,

Heirs at Law of John W. Burton, On petition for writ of certiorari

deceased, Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court

235 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

John W. Haas, John C. Trichel, and

John H. Bird.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. R. Poste,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

236

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New River Collieries Company,
a Corporation, et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

237

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emilio Gorbea, Trustee, Barrionnuevo,
Zeno & Co., Bankrupts,
Petitioners,
vs.
Credito y Ahorro Ponceno..

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

239

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Marco and Antonio Bruno, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

240

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of California, Petitioner, vs. William M. Mouse. On petition for writ of certiorarit to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

241

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Christian Biermacher. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

242

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Southern Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

243 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Presley M. Ireland,

Petitioner,

244 vs.

John W. Keister, Apex Coal Company, a corporation, Cevellan A. Butcher, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom Ung Chai, alias Tom Gum Hin,

Petitioner,

245 vs.

A. E. Burnett, as Immigration Inspector of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stout Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
246 vs.
H. R. Hayes.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest L. Benway,
Petitioner,
247 vs.
People of the State of Michigan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baker & Taylor Co.,
Petitioner,
248 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baker & Taylor Co.,

Petitioner,

249 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue, Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wyoming National Bank of Casper, Wyoming, Petitioner,

250 vs.

The Omaha National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Missouri and T. E. McClintock, Receiver, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Orville E. Babcock, et al.,

Petitioners,

254 vs.

James H. Wilkerson, District Judge.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Orenstein and Koppel Aktiengesellschaft,
Orenstein and Koppel Co., Limited, et al.,
Petitioners,
255 vs.
Koppel Industrial Car & Equipment Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis, Petitioner,
256 vs.
Pearl Lena Potterfield, administratrix of the estate of Earl Wade Potterfield, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City and County of Denver,
Petitioner,
257 vs.
The Denver Tramway Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Overlander,

Petitioner,

258 vs.

Jesse L. Overlander and Federal Trust Company of Lincoln, Nebraska.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and/or District Court of the State of Kansas, Doniphan County, 22nd Judicial District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and/or District Court of the State of Kansas, Doniphan County, 22d Judicial District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth J. Sugrue and Margaret McKay, Petitioners,

259 vs.

Sheldon W. Crilley, otherwise known as Sheldon W. Cook, Jr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edouard Saadi,

Petitioner,

262 vs.

Walter E. Carr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Triumph Trap Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
Walter A. Gibbs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Davenport Oil Company,
Petitioner,
264 vs.
Charles G. Davenport.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Paridy and Anna McLatchie,
Petitioners,
265 vs.
The Caterpillar Tractor Company, substituted as defendant for the Holt Manufacturing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Christine Hopkins,
Petitioner,
266 vs.
The State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walker Manufacturing Co.,
Petitioner,
268 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pettibone-Mulliken Company,
Petitioner,
269 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company, Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Company, Duluth Boiler Works, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha,
Petitioner,
270 vs.
Olivier Straw Goods Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Gordon,
Petitioner,
271 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

"Lefty" Clayton, alias John Doucett,
Petitioner,
301 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William C. Atwater & Company,
Inc., Petitioner,
275 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel Machin and Austin A. Cooper,
Petitioners,
276 vs.
Nicollet Hotel, Incorporated, Glen ..... Dixson, A. E. Zonne, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. Leslie Parker,
Petitioner,
277 vs.
Harry F. Sinclair.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Shellenbarger, Petitioner, vs. The State of Ohio. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio

280

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. J. Bosler, Hal H. Pell. H. M. Cooley, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

281

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nicholas Colla and G. DeCola, partners, trading as Colla and DeCola, Petitioners, vs. Bank of Italy. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

282

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. C. Tucker,

Petitioner,

283 vs.

Acel C. Alexander, as Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sound Motor Boat Service, Inc.,

Petitioner,

285 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sam Seldin,

Petitioner,

286 vs.

The Threadneedle Insurance Co.(1923) Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. Magnolia Provision Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

287

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Magnolia Provision Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

288

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Houston Packing Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

289

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Zenith-Detroit Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Stromberg Motor Devices Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

291

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. B. Barton, Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

293

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Petitioner, vs. J. L. Meetaux. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

294

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
297 vs.
Nelita Franklin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Murray G. Brady,
Petitioner,
298 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James S. McCandless,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
United States Board of Tax Appeals.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Freddie Thomas,
Petitioner,
302 vs.
J. McD. Trimble, C. A. Braley, R. C. Adams, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Carlo,
Petitioner,
307 vs.
Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Furness, Withy & Company, Limited.,
Petitioner,
303 vs.
Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, as Trustee, etc., and Frank White, Treasurer of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cora A. Poindexter, as Administratrix of the Estate of Harry Grant Poindexter, deceased, Petitioner,
308 vs.
Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bertha Wilson, as Administratrix of the Estate of Luther C. Wilson, deceased, Petitioner,
309 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Illinois State Trust Company, Petitioner,
310 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Indiana Quartered Oak Company,
Petitioner,
311 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bank Line, Limited,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
Harry C. Porter, trading as H. & L. Chase, Riegel Sack Company, Roger-Pyatt Shellac Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aktieselskabet Dea,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Walter Wrightson, as managing owner of American Schooner "Copperfield."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. W. Trickett and Justus N. Baird,
Petitioners,
316 vs.
The Kaw Valley Drainage District and The City of Kansas City, Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Citizens' Wholesale Supply Co.,
Petitioner,
317 vs.
The Welber Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McPherson Brothers Company,
Petitioner,
318 vs.
Okanogan-Douglas Inter-County Bridge Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Noyes and Joe Babb, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 409

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per. Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner, vs. James A. Dick Company, et al. 411

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George E. Mayor, Petitioner, vs. Central Vermont Railway Company. 419

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Patrick F. Ryan, as Administrator of the Estate of William J. Smith, deceased, Aetna Accident & Liability Co., Petitioners,
420 vs.
John E. Cormany, et al., as heirs at law of William J. Smith, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mar Fow Lun,
Petitioner,
425 vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco, California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leonard Goodwin Husar,
Petitioner,
434 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Emil W. Schmutz,

Petitioner,

435 vs.

The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. The Chicago Bar Association.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas Company,

Petitioner,

443 vs.

Gulf Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. E. Ratliffe, L. Siess, R. D. McMahon, et al., Petitioners,

445 vs.

Joe E. Myers, Unity Oil Company, W. P. H. McFaddin, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George W. Heintz and American
Electric Racing Association, Inc.,
Petitioners,
449 vs.
Owen P. Smith (Hannah M. Smith,
Administratrix of the Estate of Owen
P. Smith, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

By acts of Congress January 31, 1928, and April 26, 1928, the issuing of writs of error by this Court was abolished and such cases are now made reviewable by appeal but under the same restrictions and limitations as formerly required on writs of error. To meet the legislative changes in this and other respects new rules were adopted and made effective July 1, 1928. In order to prevent baseless appeals for which there is no jurisdiction, before they are reached for hearing, appellant is required to file a printed statement disclosing the basis upon which jurisdiction of the appeal is asserted, including the statutory provisions on which it is based, the pertinent pages of the record, the nature of the case, and other specifications required by the rule. The appellee is given time in which to file an opposing statement. On the second action day after the expiration of the period for filing the statements as fixed in the rule, they are to be submitted by the clerk to the Court. If the Court find that the statements indicate probable jurisdiction, an entry showing this will be made in each case. Should the Court find that there is no showing of jurisdiction by appeal, the case will be dismissed. If the appeal is from a final judgment or decree of a state court, and under section 237(c) the would-be appellant is entitled to have his appeal treated as a petition for certiorari, the Court will consider the petition and make proper order thereon.

Upon the printed statements submitted on October 8 under rule 12 the following notations and orders are made:

No. 260. Ivy L. Leonard and Thomas B. Leonard, copartners, trading as I. L. Leonard Company, plaintiffs in error and appellants, v. Swepson Earle, Conservation Commissioner;

No. 273. The Ann Arbor Railroad Company et al., appellants, v. The United States of America et al;

No. 278. The Cudahy Packing Company, a corporation, appellant, v. Jay Grant Hinkle, Secretary, etc.;

No. 296. James H. Nelson and Clyde Randolph, doing business, etc., v. Commonwealth of Kentucky, by Milton Board, Revenue Atent, etc.;

No. 305. The United States of America, appellant, v. Fruit Growers Express Company;

No. 321. Leon Sampere, plaintiff in error, and appellant, v. The City of New Orleans;

No. 322. John A. McKay, appellant, v. Hector McInnes, Stuart Jenks, et al.; and

No. 352. Abraham Braunstein, plaintiff in error and appellant, v. The People of the State of New York on the complaint of Gertrude E. McCarthy.

In all these cases the Court find that probably jurisdiction has been shown.

C. A. Oyster and W. A. Watson,
partners doing business as
Sebring-Alliance Bus Line,
Plaintiffs in error,
vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of
Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

253

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. A. Oyster and W. A. Watson,
partners doing business as
Lebring-Alliance Bus Line,
Plaintiffs in error,
253 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of
Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George J. J. Mackay,
Plaintiff in error,
274 vs.
The State of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George J. J. Mackay,
Plaintiff in error,
274 vs.
The State of Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wm. O. Bohnefeld,

Plaintiff in error and appellant,

279 vs.

Security National Bank.

In error to and appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court thtat the writ of error and appeal in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carson Petroleum Company,

Plaintiff in error and appellant,

306 vs.

Leon C. Vial, Sheriff and Tax Collector of the Parish of St. Charles, R. A. DeBroca, Assessor for the Parish of St. Charles, et al.

In error to and appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error and appeal in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

. Leave
nted plain-
n error and
nt to file
f supporting
plication for
rari within
s and oppos-
ounsel 10 days
which to reply

Wm. O. Bohnefeld,

Petitioner,

279 vs.

Security National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. B. Carris Properties, Inc., and W. L. Shoemaker, Appellants, vs. John W. Martin, as Governor, Ernest Amos, as Comptroller, John C. Luning, as Treasurer, etc., et al.

313

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Era W. Moore (formerly Era W. Cobb) joined by her husband C. G. Moore, A. N. Green, et al., Appellants, vs. A. H. Downing, Tax Collector of Stephens County, Texas, T. C. Hefner, Tax Assessor of Stephens County, Texas, et al.

385

Appeal from the Court of Civil Appeals, 11th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, 11th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Era W. Moore, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. A. H. Downing, Tax Collector etc.

385

It is now here ordered by this Court that the appellant in this cause be given leave to file a brief supporting an application for certiorari within 15 days of this date, and opposing counsel 10 days within which to reply.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John G. Rouse, Executor of the will of William C. Rouse,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. E. A. Harriman, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of Rhode Island, as amicus curiae, in this case.

Benjamin Russell, J. M. Steverson, et al.,
Petitioners,
58 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Edward S. Bentley, leave was granted to file a brief of Louis O. Van Doren, William R. Conklin, and Edward S. Bentley, as amici curiae, herein.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, and James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, et al.

The motion for leave to file the bill of complaint here was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford E. Smith for the complainant.

Oliver Cadillac Company,
Plaintiff in error,
47 vs.
Edward E. Christopher, Building Commissioner of the City of St. Louis, Missouri, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

There for, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Marie Doucet et al., Plaintiffs in error, 113 vs. Louis Fontenot, Sheriff, and Jules Menou.	The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph George Medlenka for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Harry P. Sneed for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission Appellants, 355 vs. Anchor Coal Company et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Blackburn Esterline, and Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellants.
Barton Coal Company, et al., Appellants, 356 vs. Anchor Coal Company et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest S. Ballard and Mr. Frank E. Harkness for the appellants.
Pittsburgh Operators' Lake Rate Committee et al., Appellants, 357 vs. Anchor Coal Company et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. August G. Gutheim for the appellants.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al., Appellants, 358 vs. Anchor Coal Company et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. D. McKenney, Mr. Andrew P. Martin, Mr. Atlee Pomerene, Mr. W. M. King, and Mr. C. F. Taplin for the appellants.

Firemens' Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, Appellant, 376 vs. James A. Beha, as Superintendent, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellant.
W. D. Manley, Appellant, 429 vs. The State of Georgia.	The statement as to jurisdiction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur Gray Powell, Mr. Marion Smith, and Mr. Walter T. Colquitt for the appellant.
Jackson Eastern Railway Company, et al., Petitioners, 28 vs. W. W. Burns, E. B. Nettleton, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Neville for the petitioners, and by Mr. Victor W. Gilbert for the respondents.
John G. Rouse, Executor of the will of William C. Rouse, Petitioner, 393 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Markell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Dwight E. Rorer for the respondent.

W. H. Baugh,
Petitioner,
437 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Hawley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Elizabeth Beck, Katherine Ferneding, et al., Petitioners,
441 vs.
Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, et al.
Elizabeth Beck, Katherine Ferneding, et al., Petitioners,
442 vs.
State of Wisconsin.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Quarles and Mr. Malcolm K. Whyte for the petitioners, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds, Mr. Franklin E. Bump, Mr. Eugene Wengert, and Mr. Daniel W. Sullivan for the respondents.

The Robert Dollar Company,
Petitioner,
444 vs.
American Asiatic Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. M. Fitzgerald for the respondent.

Eulahmae Reed,
Petitioner,
446 vs.
Mary Narcomery, nee Leader, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. J. Roberts for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. B. Campbell and Mr. W. W. Pryor for the respondents.

John J. Satterthwait and P. J. Hurley, Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
448 vs.
McMan Oil and Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. T. R. Boone, Mr. John H. Stone, Mr. J. M. McCormich, Mr. Robert H. Richards, and Mr. John B. King for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. L. Batts, Mr. A. H. Carrigan, Mr. Harry H. Rogers, Mr. John Rogers, and Mr. A. H. Britain for the respondent.

Morris Company et al., Petitioners,
450 vs.
Skandinavia Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Lee, Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. Garner Wynn Green, and Mr. Chalmers Potter for the petitioners, and by Mr. Palmer Pillans for the respondent.

Mrs. A. E. Caswell, individually, etc., Petitioners,
452 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. D. Lipscomb and Mr. C. W. Howth for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. H. Francis, Mr. Walace Hawkins, and Mr. Barry Mohun for the respondents.

The Board of Trustees of the Anton Chico Land Grant, Petitioner,
453 vs.
Robert L. Brown, Thomas Carson, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stephen B. Davis and Mr. C. J. Roberts for the petitioner.

Mrs. M. M. Brice, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
463 vs.
The Texas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. K. T. McConnico and Mr. John A. Pitts for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Anderson and Mr. [illegible] B. Keesle for the respondent.

Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
468 vs.
Illinois Fuel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel W. Kirby and Mr. Donald C. Strachan for the respondent.

J. Pleasant Harris, Petitioner,
471 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Loys Charbonnet for the petitioner, and by Mr. Percy Saint and Mr. Eugene Stanley for the respondent.

United Fuel Gas Company, Appellant,
4 vs.
The Public Service Commission of West Virginia, I. Wade Coffman, et al.
The United Fuel Gas Company, a Corporation, and Warfield Natural Gas Company, a Corporation, Appellants,
1 vs.
The Railroad Commission of Kentucky, Frank N. Burns, et al., etc.

Four hours were allowed for the oral argument of these cases. The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Robert S. Spillman for the appellees, in No. 4.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associates Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley D. Willis, It is ordered that Dion R. Holm, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. Flynn, It is ordered that Stephen B. Christian, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry B. Hazard, It is ordered that Henry Elliott, Jr., Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank R. Reid, It is ordered that Harry J. Dunbaugh, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey, It is ordered that Martin J. Lund, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

United Fuel Gas Company,
Appellant,
4 vs.
Public Service Commission of West Virginia, et al.
United Fuel Gas Company, a corporation, and Warfield Natural Gas Co., a corporation, Appellants,
1 vs.
The Railroad Commission of Kentucky, Frank N. Burns, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Robert S. Spillman for the appellees in No. 4 and concluded by Mr. John T. Diederich for the appellees in No. 1. Leave was granted appellants to file a reply brief within one week on motion of Mr. John W. Davis.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon C. Godley, and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
159 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Co. and Manhattan Ry. Co.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Irwin Untermyer for the appellant, the Transit Commission of New York, and continued by Mr. Charles L. Craig for appellant, the City of New York.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Darby, It is ordered that Arthur H. Van Horn, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton C. Elliott, It is ordered that Howard C. Kelly, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon C. Godley, and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al., Appellants,

159 vs.

Interborough Rapid Transit Co. and Manhattan Ry. Co.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles L. Craig for the appellant, the city of New York; by Mr. William L. Ransom and Mr. George W. Wickersham for the appellees; and by Mr. Charles L. Craig for the appellant, the city of New York. Leave was granted to appellees to file an additional brief within four days and to appellants to

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Calvin T. Milans, It is ordered that Rodney Bedell, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Forrest Reilly, It is ordered that John A. Bresnahan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conder C. Henry, It is ordered that Charles C. Eidler, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mate H. Pier, It is ordered that Margaret P. Gross, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Myers, It is ordered that James R. Burdge and E. Russell Kennedy, Jr., Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph Norton, It is ordered that Robert E. L. Lewis, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Rae Williams, It is ordered that Allen B. Howland, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of
The Public National Bank of
New York, Petitioner,
16, Original.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief in behalf of the City of New York, and a motion for leave to present oral argument was submitted by Mr. Eugene Fay.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon C. Godley, and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al., Appellants,
159 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Co. and Manhattan Ry. Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles L. Craig for the appellant, the City of New York, and concluded by Mr. Irwin Untermyer for the appellant, the Transit Commission of New York.

Boston Sand & Gravel Co., Petitioner,
15 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was reargued by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the respondent.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Petitioner,
35 vs.
De Forest Radio Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., and Edward H. Armstrong, Petitioners,
36 vs.
United States of America, Alexander Meissner, et al.

Three hours were allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira J. Adams, It is ordered that Harry E. Dunham, Esquire, of Schenectady, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Wright, It is ordered that Harry Levine, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, It is ordered that R. F. Burdine, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Petitioner,
35 vs.
De Forest Radio Telephone & Telegraph Co.
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. and Edward H. Armstrong, Petitioners,
36 vs.
United States of America, Alexander Meissner, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the petitioners, by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the petitioners.

C. A. Hansen, Plaintiff in error,
37 vs.
Stirrat & Goetz Investment Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Martin J. Lund for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Henry Elliott, Jr., for the defendant in error.

Richard Crane, Petitioner,
38 vs.
Commonwealth of Virginia and County of Charles City.

This case was argued by Mr. A. W. Patterson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leon M. Bazile for the respondents.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond Jones, It is ordered that C. Earl Hovey, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter J. Suthon, Jr., It is ordered that Benjamin B. Taylor, Esquire, of Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moultrie Hitt, It is ordered that Norman I. Miller, and George C. Spence, Esquires, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roderick Bedd, It is ordered that Theodore R. Jaffe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., It is ordered that Powell C. Croner, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell, It is ordered that Curtis M. Shelter, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roderick Bedd, It is ordered that Jeremiah A. O'Leary, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Anna Marie Maney,

Petitioner,

27 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mrs. Marie Doucet, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
113 vs.
Louis Fontenot, Sheriff, and Jules Menou.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Marie Doucet, et al.,
Petitioners,
113 vs.
Louis Fontenot, Sheriff and Jules Menou.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
——, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, and James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that a rule issue upon the defendants, returnable Monday, November 19th next, to show cause why leave to file the bill of complaint herein should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. Hansen,

Plaintiff in error, vs. Stirrat & Goetz Investment Company.

37 In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard Crane,

Petitioner, vs. Commonwealth of Virginia and County of Charles City.

38 On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

No. 305. The United States of America, appellant, v. Fruit Growers Express Company;

No. 182. Allie E. Lewis and William Lloyd Lewis, petitioners, v. The United States of America;

No. 352. Abraham Braunstein, plaintiff in error and appellant, v. The People of the State of New York on the complaint of Gertrude E. McCarthy;;and

No. 429. W. D. Manley, appellant, v. The State of Georgia.

These criminal cases upon the docket are advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, December 3 next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

No. 355. The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, appellants, v. Anchor Coal Company et al;

No. 356. Barton Coal Company et al., appellants, v. Anchor Coal Company et al.

No. 357. Pittsburgh Operators' Lake Rate Committee et al., appellants, v. Anchor Coal Company, et al;

No. 358. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al., appellants, v. Anchor Coal Company et al;

No. 376. Firemens' Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, appellant, v. James A. Beha, as Superintendent, etc.; and

No. 429. W. D. Manley, appellant, v. The State of Georgia.

In these cases the Court find that probably jurisdiction has been shown.

Pampanga Sugar Mills, Petitioner,
325 vs.
Wenceslao Trinidad, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
335 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Martin Riehle, as Receiver in Equity of the Morosco Holding Company, Inc., Petitioner,
347 vs.
Edward Margolies.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Shanker Laxman Gokhale, Petitioner,
361 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
363 vs.
Alfred Klesner, doing business under the name "Shade Shop," Hooper & Klesner.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States Printing and Lithograph Company, Petitioner,

372 vs.

Griggs, Cooper & Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,

375 vs.

California Cooperative Canneries.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

407 vs.

Old Colony Railroad.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Niels Peter Claussen, Petitioner,
416 vs.
Hon. Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris & Company, et al., Petitioners,
450 vs.
Skandinavia Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Baptist Home Mission Society, Petitioner,
320 vs.
Jackson Barnett, a Mental Incompetent by Elmer S. Bailey, his Prochein Ami and United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. L. Slayton & Company, of Toledo, Ohio, Petitioner,
323 vs.
Winston County, Alabama, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John S. Hunter, Petitioner,
324 vs.
Harry E. Baker, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harold E. Engemoen, Petitioner,
326 vs.
Charles L. Rea, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel A. Stapleton,

Petitioner,

327 vs.

Reading Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. A. Apple and Jake L. Hamon,
Administrators of the Estate
of Jake L. Hamon, deceased,

Petitioners,

328 vs.

American National Bank of Ardmore,
Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Auxiliary Schooner "Mistinguette," her
Engine, Tackle, Apparel, Furniture, etc.,

Petitioner,

329 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

416 Cases, C. T. Wishkey, 290
Cases H. & L. Whiskey, etc., ex
French Schooner, "Mistinguette,"
etc., Petitioner,
330 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is here by, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

63 Kegs of Malt, containing
approximately 16 gallons each,
5 Tanks of Malt, etc., ex British
Auxiliary Schooner "Rosie M.B.,"
Petitioner,
331 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel G. Wetzler and Joseph B. Bloom, doing business as Blue Seal Chemical Company, Petitioners, vs. Edward R. Rolfree, doing business as "X" Laboratories.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

332

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Malissie B. Dawson, Administratrix of the Estate of Joseph Dawson, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Reading Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

333

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Northern Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
334 vs.
Alice Edith Schwartz.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
336 vs.
Jacob Telfair Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation,
Petitioner,
337 vs.
Catz American Shipping Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gabriel Benitez, Petitioner,
338 vs.
The People of the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
339 vs.
John Waid.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jay A. Heidbrink and The Heidbrink Company, Petitioner,
340 vs.
Charles W. Hardessen Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James R. Hatmaker,
Petitioner,
341 vs.
The Dry Milk Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great American Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
342 vs.
Raymond W. Johnson and Noah S. Parks.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clifton L. Richards,
Petitioner,
343 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Montgomery Ward & Co., Incorporated, Petitioner,
345 vs.
Walter A. Gibbs.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeal for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cook-o'Brien Construction Company, Petitioner,
346 vs.
L. L. Crawford.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kate R. Bondurant, Chester Reid Bondurant, et al., etc., etal., Petitioners,
348 vs.
Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kate R. Bondurant, Chester Reid Bondurant, a Minor, First National Bank of Mayfield, Kentucky, et al., etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company of Springfield, Massachusetts. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

349

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kate R. Bondurant and Chester R. Bondurant, Petitioners, vs. Lilburn Phelps, as Clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

350

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Porto Rican American Tobacco Company of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Juan G. Gallardo, Treasurer of Porto Rico. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

353

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that

Augustine C. Sanford,
Petitioner,
354 vs.
American Seating Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, at the Relation and to the Use of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
360 vs.
C. M. Danuser, J. T. Waddill and Forest Smith, as Members, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri, at the relation
of Charles M. Hurst and C. J. Stefien, Petitioners,
362 vs.
Charles H. Daues, Wm. DeeBecker and
Simon G. Hipper, Judges, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. M. Hunn, Executor of the
Estate of F. L. Miner, deceased,
F. L. Townsend, George C.
Carpenter, et al., Petitioners,
365 vs.
E. A. Lewis, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Consolidation Coal Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
366 vs.
Societa Commerciale di Navigazione,
owner and claimant of S.S. "Valtellina."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry L. Reed,
Petitioner,
367 vs.
Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railway Company, Petitioner,
368 vs.
William Van Loon.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lancaster Iron Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
369 vs.
J. C. Penney-Gwinn Corporation, Robert H. McArdle, The Shoreland Company, Claimant, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lancaster Iron Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
370 vs.
J. C. Penney-Gwinn Corporation, Robert H. McArdle, The Shoreland Company, Claimant, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioner,
373 vs.
J. E. Westover.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Warner Moore and Thomas L. Moore, copartners doing busines under the firm name and style of Warner Moore & Co., Petitioners,
374 vs.
The United States of America, as owner and claimant of the steamship "Milwaukee Bridge," et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul C. Keyes, Receiver of the First National Bank of Eureka, South Dakota, Petitioner,
378 vs.
First National Bank of Aberdeen, South Dakota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel J. Shields, Petitioner,
379 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Societa Nazionale Di Navigazione, claimant of the Steamship "Ansaldo San Giorgia I," her engines, boilers, etc., Petitioner,
381 vs.
The Rheinstrom Brothers Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Humphreys Oil Company and The Pure Oil Co., Petitioners,
382 vs.
Joe Will Tatum and wife Lizzie Tatum, L. C. Puckett, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railway Company,
Petitioner,
383 vs.
Aven H. Stierwalt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Haar,
Petitioner,
384 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
386 vs.
School District No. 1 of the City of Hayward, Wisconsin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. Machlett & Son,
Petitioner,
387 vs.
Claude Neon Lights, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Order of the United Commercial Travelers of America,
Petitioner,
388 vs.
Minnie Carbush.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Leroy Lewis,
Petitioner,
391 vs.
Lewis Jones, Administrator of the Estate of Tom Chapman, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anaconda Copper Mining Company,

Petitioner,

392 vs.

Carson Investment Company and John Henry Miller, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

I. H. Makdimen,

Petitioner,

394 vs.

First National Bank and Merchants National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ruth B. DeHanas and Jesse L. DeHanas,

Petitioners,

395 vs.

Cortez-King Brand Mines Co., H. B. Church, Jr., Former Board of Directors of Union Zinc Co., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ernest A. Morosa and Mary Mathryn Morosa, Petitioner,
396 vs.
Hillsdale County, State of Michigan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Michael Gillam, as Master and Claimant of Schooner "Vinces" and her cargo, Petitioner,
397 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Francis L. Klingle, Petitioner,
398 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lau Ah Leong,
Petitioner,
401 vs.
Fung Dai Kim Ah Leong.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lottie C. Conklin, as Administratrix of the Estate of George Heizman, deceased,
Petitioner,
402 vs.
The United States of America and Sadie Mae Deavenport, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. R. Grace & Company,
Petitioner,
404 vs.
New Orleans & South American Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edgar J. Phillips and Earl A. Darr, as Executors of the last will and testament of Henry P. Draft, deceased, Petitioners, vs. Edward E. Gnichtel, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Fifth District of New Jersey.

405 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sixto Talag, Petitioner, vs. C. E. Nathorst.

406 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stanley's Incorporated Store No. Three, Petitioner, vs. H. R. Earl, Bankrupt.

410 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Joseph Chernik,
Petitioner,
412 vs.
Clyde Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. R. Freeman and C. Boettcher, as Receivers of the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad Company, Petitioners,
413 vs.
Bonnie E. Frasher, Administratrix of the Estate of Harry E. Frasher, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Glenn Stineman,
Petitioner,
417 vs.
Peninsula State Steamship Corporation, as owner of the Steamship "Lake Calewood,"

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Freda Bergeron,

Petitioner,

418 vs.

The Travelers Insurance Company of Hartford, Conn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Telephone & Telegraph Company, Petitioner,

421 vs.

Caroline Wilks, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels & Estate of Joseph Wilks, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Erie.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Erie, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simon F. Williams, as Administrator of the Estate of Martha S. Painter, deceased, et al., Petitioners,

427 vs.

Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Simon F. Williams, as Administrator of the Estate of Martha S. Painter, deceased, Petitioner,
428 vs.
Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. E. Quinn, Petitioner,
447 vs.
Rozina P. Davis, et Vir.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jackson & Eastern Railway Company,
W. I. Luke and S. A. Neville, Plaintiff in error,
28 vs.
W. W. Burns, E. B. Nettleton, A. S. McClendon, etc., et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jackson & Eastern Railway Company,

W. I. Luke and S. A. Neville, Petitioners,

28 vs.

W. W. Burns, E. B. Nettleton, A. S. McClendon, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John G. Rouse, Executor of the Will of William C. Rouse, Petitioner,

393 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. H. Baugh, Petitioner,

437 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth Beck, Katherine Ferneding,
Waldemar Helmholz, et al.,
Petitioners,
441 vs.
Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, Henry
Bulder and John Rutkowski.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth Beck, Katherine Ferneding,
Waldemar Helmholz, et al.,
Petitioners,
442 vs.
State of Wisconsin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Robert Dollar Company,
Petitioner,
444 vs.
American Asiatic Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eulahmae Reed,

Petitioner,

446 vs.

Mary Marcomery nee Leader, Lucy Bruner nee Leader, Loske Harjo, etc., et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John J. Satterthwait and P. J. Hurley, Receivers of the Gilliland Oil Company,

Petitioners,

448 vs.

McMan Oil and Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. A. E. Caswell, individually and as Executrix, etc., George W. Caswell, Mrs. Elizabeth Edwards, et al.,

Petitioners,

452 vs.

Magnolia Petroleum Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the

The Board of Trustees of the Anton Chico Land Grant, Petitioner,
453 vs.
Robert L. Brown, Thomas Carson, Gilbert L. Curtiss, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. M. M. Brice, Administratrix of Mason M. Brice, Deceased, Petitioner,
463 vs.
The Texas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
468 vs.
Illinois Fuel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Pleasant Harris,
Petitioner,
471 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

The Court will take a recess from Monday, October 29th until Monday, November 19th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Barbee Wick, Schuyler J. Gray, and Dora Gray, Plaintiffs in error,
87 vs.
The Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for the County of Chelan, et al.

The motion to pass and to consolidate herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Sullivan for the plaintiffs in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frank T. Post, Mr. Charles S. Albert, Mr. F. G. Dorety, Mr. Thomas Balmer, and Mr. Edwin C. Matthias for the defendants in error in opposition thereto.

John L. Shevenell and Helmar G. Josephson, Trustees,
Petitioners,
——, Original. vs.
James M. Morton, Jr., U. S. District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., for the petitioner, in that behalf, with leave to respondent to file brief in opposition thereto within 10 days, on motion of Mr. Marcus B. May.

Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky, Petitioner,
481 vs.
A. J. A. Alexander.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. George V. Triplett, leave was granted to file a brief for the respondent within 10 days.

G. A. Oyster and W. A. Watson, partners, etc., Plaintiffs in error,
253 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Chrtis M. Shetler for the defendant in error, the mandate was granted in this case.

Serverino Alberto, Petitioner,
364 vs.
Bonifacio Nicolas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. J. A. Hull for the petitioner.

Cole Storage Battery Company, Petitioner,
377 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marvin Farrington and Mr. Harry C. Kinne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the respondent.

The Mantle Lamp Company of America, Inc., of Chicago, Illinois, Petitioner,
431 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marvin Farrington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Thomas D. Taylor, Petitioner,
436 vs.
The Burr Printing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry A. Craig for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lucius F. Robinson for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner,
440 vs.
The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. Harr and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the respondent.

Dr. T. A. Dreher and Mrs. Ada Bonner Le Boeuf, Petitioner,
451 vs.
The State of Louisiana.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eldon S. Lazarus for the petitioners.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner,
454 vs.
John Rock.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, and/or Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Palmer and Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herbert H. Patterson for the respondent.

Jessie Margaret Wilson Budlong, Petitioner,
457 vs.
Milton J. Budlong.
Jessie Margaret Budlong, Petitioner,
458 vs.
Milton J. Budlong.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Newport County, State of Rhode Island, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Jessie M. W. Budlong, pro se, and by Mr. Authur M. Allen for the respondent.

Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner,
467 vs.
Guy Tilley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Bates and Mr. J. H. Tallichet for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles M. Smithdeal and Mr. Alexander W. Spence for the respondent.

Frank N. Eich, Petitioner,
470 vs.
Joseph Czervonko, Anna Czervonko and Home Bank and Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry W. Standidge and Mr. Justus Chancellor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sherman C. Spitzer and Mr. George Gillette for the respondents.

John L. Shevenell and Helmar G. Josephson, Trustees, Petitioners,
476 vs.
George J. Kelly, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Boyle, Jr. for the petitioners, and by Mr. Marcus B. May for the respondent.

Hugh W. Grant, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
479 vs.
A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James P. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. William L. Day, Mr. Conrad H. Poppenhusen, Mr. Edward R. Johnston, and Mr. Henry Jackson Darby for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
481 vs.
A. J. A. Alexander.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. C. M. Charest , and Mr. Edward H. Horton for the petitioner.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
482 vs.
J. Harry Wiener.

C. F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
483 vs.
J. Harry Wiener.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Thomas H. Lewis, Jr., for the petitioners.

Lawrence Copyley Thaw,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
Mary Copley Thaw by Matthew C. Fleming, her guardian ad litem.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. David H. Taylor, and Mr. Robert B. Knowles for the petitioner, and by Mr. David A. Reed, and Mr. Matthew C. Fleming for the respondent.

Percy McGeorge,
Petitioner,
488 vs.
Island Development Company and Atlantic-Brigantine Bridge Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Mercer Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert E. Steinem for the respondent.

Atlanta and Charlotte Air Line Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
495 vs.
R. F. Green.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. F. G. Tompkins, Mr. H.O'B. Cooper, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioners, and by Mr. Horace L. Bomar for the respondent.

Journeymen Stone Cutters Association of North America, Michael W. Mitchell, et al.,
Appellants,
72 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Jeremiah A. O'Leary for the appellants. The argument was suspended, and counsel afforded opportunity to consider the effect upon this appeal of a failure to serve a summons and severance on certain defendants.

Talbert W. Hughes, Plaintiff in error, 110 vs. The State Board of Medical Examiners. Nathan A. Hughes, Plaintiff in error, 111 vs. The State Board of Medical Examiners.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Norman I. Miller for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. George C. Spence for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
International Shoe Company, Plaintiff in error, 12 vs. I. Pinkus, George Franklin, et al.	This case was reargued by Mr. J. D. Williamson for the plaintiff in error and submitted by Mr. Lamar Williamson for the defendants in error. Leave was granted to file a brief for the plaintiff in error by Thursday next.
Francis Beidler II and George Engelking, as Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error, 39 vs. South Carolina Tax Commission.	This case was argued by Mr. P. F. Henderson for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. J. Fraser Lyon for the defendant in error.
Remington Arms Union Metallic Cartridge Company, Inc., Petitioner, 40 vs. The United States.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Wallace Jr., for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Donovan, It is ordered that Thomas T. C. Gregory, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George I. Haight, It is ordered that Allin H. Pierce, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George I. Haight, It is ordered that Horace Dawson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Townsend, It is ordered that Joseph G. Myerson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that Horace M. Street, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond Jones It is ordered that William R. Coley, Esquire, of Wilkinsburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Donovan, It is ordered that Harold B. Teegarden, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene M. Meacham, It is ordered that Harry Ellsworth Foster, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States,
Petitioner,
46 vs.
Cambridge Loan and Building Co.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. L. L. Hamby, leave was granted to file a brief of Cleveland R. Cross and Herbert W. Nauts, as amici curiae in this case.

Journeymen Stone Cutters Association of North American et al.,
Appellants,
72 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Jeremiah A. O'Leary, leave was granted appellants to file a brief within one week as to the effect upon this appeal of a failure to serve a summons and severance on certain

Remington Arms Union Metallic Cartridge Co., Inc., Petitioner, 40 vs. The United States.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William Wallace, Jr. for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Northern Coal & Dock Co., and General Accident, Fire & Life Assurance Corporation, Ltd., of Perth, Scotland, Petitioners, 41 vs. Emma Strand and Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.	This case was argued by Mr. Charles Quarles for the petitioners, and by Mr. Mortimer Levitan for the respondent.
Daniel Kelleher, Appellant, 42 vs. C. T. French.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. R. C. Cocke for the appellant, The Court declined to hear further argument.
The Kansas City Southern Railway Co. and Texarkana & Fort Smith Ry. Co., Petitioners, 43 vs. Roy Hooper, Tax Collector, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Frank H. Moore for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. E. C. Lake for the respondent.
George W. P. Hunt, as Governor of the State of Arizona, et al., etc., Appellants, 44 vs. The United States of America.	This case was argued by Mr. Earl Anderson for the appellants and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellee. Counsel to agree if possible upon a modification of the decree to be submitted to the Court.

Fairbanks, Morse & Co., Inc.,
Plaintiff in error,
45 vs.
Baton Rouge Rice Mill, Inc., et al., etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter J. Suthon, Jr., for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States,
Petitioner,
46 vs.
Cambridge Loan and Building Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. T. H. Lewis, Jr. for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. King, It is ordered that Frank J. Foley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace Andrews, It is ordered that Virgil M. Gibbs, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stiles W. Burr, It is ordered that Ivan F. Phipps, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States, Petitioner, 46 vs. Cambridge Loan and Building Co.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. T. H. Lewis, Jr., for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the respondent.
The United States, Petitioner, 48 vs. Robert H. Lenson.	This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. George A. King for the respondent.
Pacific Steamship Co., Petitioner, 49 vs. Carl G. Peterson.	This case was argued by Mr. W. C. Morrow for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry E. Foster for the respondent.
Roy O. West, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner, 71 vs. Standard Oil Co.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. C. Morrow for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. [illegible], It is ordered that Guy H. Burnside, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis, It is ordered that Adam H. Moss and William C. Wolfe, Esquires, of Orangeburg, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Roy O. West, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
71 vs.
Standard Oil Co.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. W. C. Morrow for the petitioner, by Mr. Oscar Sutro and Mr. Louis Titus for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. W. C. Morrow for the petitioners.

Mary Myers Parker, John C. Myers, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
52 vs.
The Tax Com[illegible]ssion of Ohio

Mary Myers Parker, John C. Myers, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
53 vs.
The Tax Commission of Ohio.

The State Road Commission of West Virginia et al., Plaintiffs in error,
55 vs.
Monongahela West Penn Public Service Co., et al.
The State Road Commission of West Virginia and Reynolds Taxi Co., Plaintiffs in error,
56 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.
State Road Commission of West Virginia et al., Plaintiffs in error,
57 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. Horace Andrews for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Virgil H. Gibbs for the defendant in error.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Fred O. Blue for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. Clephane, It is ordered that Louis L. Babcock, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis, It is ordered that Lionel K. Legge and Jno. P. Grace, Esquires, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter M. Krimbill, It is ordered that Thomas A. Lynch, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner,
454 vs.
John Rock.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. George F. Snyder, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief for the petitioner.

The State Road Commission of West Virginia et al., Plaintiffs in error, 55 vs. Monongahela West Penn Public Service Co., et al. The State Road Commission of West Virginia et al., Plaintiffs in error, 56 vs. Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., et al. State Road Commission of West Virginia, et al., Plaintiffs in error, 57 vs. Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., et al.	The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Fred O. Blue for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
A. Leo Weil and Charles M. Thorp, doing business under the firm name and style of Weil & Thorp, Petitioners, 59 vs. Edward M. Neary.	This case was argued by Mr. A. Leo Weil for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis Marshall for the respondent.
Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co., Petitioner, 62 vs. O. M. Tyner, as Administrator of George A. Marshall, deceased.	This case was argued by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lionel K. Legge and Mr. John P. Grace for the respondent.
William Douglas Moore, as Executor, etc., Plaintiffs in error, 67 vs. Newton A. K. Bugbee, Comptroller of the Treasury, etc.	This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew Foulds, Jr., for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Edward L. Katzenbach for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 O'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Howard Sutherland,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis E. Spiegler, It is ordered that Bayseff Tinkoff, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Barse, It is ordered that Fred Buerstetta, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adam R. Gard, It is ordered that S. Robert Young, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Harrell O. Hoagland, Esquire, of Worthington, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Prevost, It is ordered that Daniel Stryker, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh It is ordered that James H. Durbin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that A. Campbell Turner, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene B. Sullivan, It is ordered that Donald C. O'Regan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard F. Bresee, It is ordered that Charles D. Lewis, Esquire, of White Plains, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Beatty, It is ordered that Henry S. Manley, Esquire, of Jamestown, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Surplus Trading Company,
Plaintiff in error,
33 vs.
J. M. Haynie, as Sheriff and Ex Officio Collector of Taxes for Pulaski County, Arkansas.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that further consideration of the motion be postponed to the hearing of the case on its merits. And it is further ordered that the motion to amend the record in this cause be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Albert Barbee Wick, Schuyler, J. Gray and Dora Gray,
Plaintiffs in error,
87 vs.
The Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for the County of Chelan, The Honorable W. O. Parr, Judge, et al.

On consideration of the motion to pass this cause and to consolidate, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
35 vs.
De Forest Radio Telephone and Telegraph Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing
Company and Edward H. Armstrong,
Petitioners,
36 vs.
The United States of America,
Alexander Meissner, General Electric
Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Talbert W. Hughes,
Plaintiff in error,
110 vs.
The State Board of Medical Examiners.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nathan A. Hughes,

Plaintiff in error,

111 vs.

The State Board of Medical Examiners.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Remington Arms Union Metallic Cartridge Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

40 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel Kelleher,

Appellant,

42 vs.

G. T. French.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company and Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Company, Petitioners,

43 vs.

Roy Hooper, Tax Collector of Sevier County, Arkansas.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company, Inc., Plaintiff in error,

45 vs.

Baton Rouge Rice Mill, Inc., Mrs. Eudora S. Day, Sheriff of the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Burgin Brothers, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Road Commission of West Virginia and Reynolds Taxi Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

55 vs.

Monongahela West Penn Public Service Company, Monongahela Transport Company, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Road Commission of West Virginia and Reynolds Taxi Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

56 vs.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company West Virginia Transport Company, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State Road Commission of West Virginia and James W. Bartlett, et al., Plaintiffs in error, vs. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, West Virginia Transportation Company, et al.

57 In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. C. M. Tyner, as Administrator of George A. Marshall, deceased.

62 On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for a new trial.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Douglas Moore, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Charles E. W. Harvey, deceased,

Plaintiff in error,

67 vs.

Newton A. K. Bugbee, Comptroller of the Treasury of the State of New Jersey.

In error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Serverino Alberto,

Petitioner,

364 vs.

Bonifacio Nicolas.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States

Petitioner,

440 vs.

The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Petitioner,
454 vs.
John Rock

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, and/or to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hugh W. Grant, Receiver of The Struthers Furnace Co., Petitioners,
479 vs.
A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
482 vs.
J. Harry Wiener.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
483 vs.
J. Harry Wiener.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlanta and Charlotte Air Line Railway Company and Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
495 vs.
R. F. Green.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cole Storage Battery Company, Petitioner,
377 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bakelite Corporation,

Petitioner,

389 vs.

Frischer & Co., Inc., Randes Importing Company, Trans-atlantic Clock & Watch Company, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Mantle Lamp Company of America, Inc., of Chicago, Illinois,

Petitioner,

431 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas D. Taylor,

Petitioner,

436 vs.

The Burr Printing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dr. T. B. Dreher and Mrs. Ada Bonner LeBoeuf, Petitioners, vs. The State of Louisiana.

451

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jessie Margaret Wilson Budlong, Petitioner, vs. Milton J. Budlong.

457

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Newport County, State of Rhode Island.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Newport County, State of Rhode Island, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jessie Margaret Budlong, Petitioner, vs. Milton J. Budlong.

458

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Newport County, State of Rhode Island.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Newport County, State of Rhode Island, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner,
467 vs.
Guy Tilley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank N. Eich,
Petitioner,
470 vs.
Joseph Czervonko, Anna Czervonko and Home Bank and Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lawrence Copley Thaw,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
Mary Copley Thaw by Matthew C. Fleming her guardian ad litem.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Percy McGeorge,

Petitioner,

488 vs.

Island Development Company and

Atlantic-Brigantine Bridge Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

6 Original vs.

The State of Texas,

Defendant,

The United States,

Intervenor.

O R D E R

It is ordered that the State of Oklahoma, the State of Texas, and the United States severally show cause, if any there be, why the books of account, records, and files of the receivership in this cause heretofore stored with the Security Storage Company of Washington, D. C., as provided in the order entered herein May 11, 1925, should not be destroyed or otherwise disposed of in a manner which will relieve the Court of their further custody. Such showing shall be made and filed with the Clerk on or before the fifteenth day of November next. The Clerk shall forthwith transmit a copy of this order to the Attorney General of each of the two States before named and to the Attorney General of the United States.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of
Public National Bank of New York,
16, Original. Petitioner.

The return to the rule to show cause was presented to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell in behalf of the respondents.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of
The Bakelite Corporation,
Petitioner,
17, Original.

The return to the rule to show cause was presented to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and oral argument on the rule assigned for Wednesday, January 2, 1929, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Ex Parte: In the matter of
The Bakelite Corporation,
Petitioner,
17, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to intervene and present oral argument on behalf of Frischer & Co., Inc., Randes Importing Co., Transatlantic Clock & Watch Co., Inc., and Western Briar Pipe Co.,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Russel, J. M. Steverson,
et al., Petitioners,
58 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. John E. Lewis, leave was granted to file a brief of John E. Hughes, as amicus curiae in this case.

Charles L. Douglas,
Petitioner,
312 vs.
The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Lewis in behalf of Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner.

Everlastik, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Dwight E. Rorer for the respondent.
400	
Edward P. Lupper and Frederick M. Remich, a copartnership, etc., Petitioners, vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Titus, Mr. Geo. V. Triplett, Jr., and Mr. J. Barrett Carter for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the respondent.
433	
Harold E. West, Chairman, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland was submitted to the considerationof the Court by Mr. Raymond S. Williams and Mr. Thomas J. Tingley for the petitioners.
465	
The Fajardo Sugar Company of Porto Rico, Petitioner, vs. Frederick G. Holcomb, Auditor of Porto Rico.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David A. Buckley, Jr. and Mr. Dean Hill Stanley for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. John A. Hull for the respondent.
472	

Hyman Huebschman, doing business under the name and style of Ritz Perfume Company, Petitioner,
475 vs.
Pinaud, Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marion Butler and Mr. Alexander J. Feild for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel L. Morris for the respondent.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company, Petitioner,
478 vs.
J. G. Von Herberg, City of Seattle, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. Howe for the petitioner.

Grace C. Mitchell Johnson, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
480 vs.
Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney Thorne Able for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
484 vs.
Rosika Schwimmer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

The New York Trust Company and John F. Downing, trustees, Petitioners,

486 vs.

Continental and Commercial Trust and Savings Bank et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Edwin S. S. Sunderland for the petitioners, and by Mr. Henry Russell Platt, Mr. Richard J. Higgins, Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. Powell C. Croner, Mr. Walter H. Jacobs, Mr. Gilbert E. Porter, and Mr. Buell Mallever for the respondents.

William M. LeMoyne, Petitioner,

487 vs.

W. Espy Curtis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip H. Treacy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred T. Carton for the respondent.

F. W. Woolworth Co., Petitioner,

489 vs.

Clifford W. Calkins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Stinchfield for the petitioner.

W. & J. Sloane Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
493 vs.
Armstrong Cork Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emerson R. Newell, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence P. Byrnes and Mr. George E. Stebbins for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
494 vs.
Pillsbury Flour Mills Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Cannon and Mr. Theodore Kiendl for the petitioner, and by Mr. Van Vetchen Veeder for the respondent.

Sutter Butte Canal Co., Plaintiff in error,
403 vs.
The Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The statement as to the jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Douglas Brookman for the plaintiff in error.

The Coast Lumber Company, Lillian Dunn, and Jess Dunn, Appellants,
408 vs.
M. W. Johnson, C. A. Phillips, et al.

The statement as to the jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Hawley for the appellants.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, Appellant,
464 vs.
Harold E. West, Chairman, et al.

The statement as to the jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles McHenry Howard, Mr. Charles Markell, Mr. W. W. Willoughby, and Mr. Henry H. Waters for the appellant.

Harold E. West, Chairman, et al., Appellants,
465 vs.
The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.

The statement as to the jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond S. Williams and Mr. Thomas J. Tingley for the appellants.

Arthur E. Roberts and West End Lumber Company, Plaintiffs in error,
209 vs.
The City of Detroit, The Common Council for the City of Detroit, Philip A. Callahan, et al.

The motion to dismiss, affirm, or advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence E. Wilcox [illegible] for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. S. Homer Ferguson for the plaintiffs in error, in opposition thereto.

Ex Parte:. In the Matter of the Public National Bank of New York,
16, Original. Petitioner.

This case was argued on the return to the rule to show cause by Mr. William H. King for Andrew B. Keating as Receiver of Taxes of the City of New York et al., by Mr. Martin Saxe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry S. Manley for Albert Ottinger, as Attorney General of the State of New York, with leave to file additional brief within three days, and was submitted on printed return by Honorable Learned Hand and Honorable Augustus N. Hand, United States Circuit Judges, and Honorable William Bondy, District Judge of the United States for the Southern District of New York, respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 19, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank M. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer L. Brock, It is ordered that David W. Oyler, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Ross Perry, Jr., It is ordered that Henry W. Sohon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Pine, It is ordered that Charles A. Rogers, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Heintzman, It is ordered that William Stanley Paxson and Ray R. Maddox, Esquires, of Washington Court House, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Godfrey L. Munter, It is ordered that John J. Monahan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton W. Shreve, It is ordered that John Joseph Galbo, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. D. Rosenberg, It is ordered that Sylvan H. Kohn, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh La Master, It is ordered that Charles P. McLaughlin, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. C. Kilpatrick, It is ordered that George B. Thummel, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John D. Watkins, It is ordered that J. C. Murphy, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur L. Gilliom, It is ordered that Conner D. Rose, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Bright, It is ordered that Elmer Ellsworth Beach, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank C. Jordan, Secretary of State, and Robert V. Jordan, Deputy Secretary of State, Petitioners and plaintiffs in error, vs. K. Tashiro, M. D.; Isama Sekiyama, M.D.; Paul K. Ito, M.D.; et al. On writ of certiorari and in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

13

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The State of Washington on the relation of Seattle Title Trust Company, as Trustee Under the Last Will and Testament of Caroline Kline Galland, Deceased,

Plaintiff in error,

vs.

George W. Roberge, as Superintendent of Building of the City of Seattle.

29

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington for furtner proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

George W. P. Hunt, as Governor of the State of Arizona; D. E. Pettis, as Game Warden of the Stateof Arizona; Frank Harrison, etc.,

Appellants,

vs.

The United States of America.

44

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and as so modified is affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of The Public National Bank of New York, Petitioner.

On petition for writ of mandamus and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

16, Original.

On consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus herein, and the return to the rule to show cause;

It is now here ordered by this Court, that the rule to show cause be, discharged and the petition dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Louis K. Liggett Company, Appellant, vs. The Honorable Thomas J. Baldrige, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Charles C. Campbell, Charles E.Kramer, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

34

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

J. Smylie Herkness,

Appellant,

3 vs.

Valentine K. Irion, Commissioner of Conservation of the State of Louisiana, and Percy Saint, Attorney General of the State of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Charles Warner Company,

Petitioner,

22 vs.

Independent Pier Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs and the decree of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Charles Warner Company,

Petitioner,

23 vs.

Steamship "Gulftrade," Whereof Gulf Refining Company is Claimant.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs and the decree of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. George C. Bryant,

Plaintiff in error,

2 vs.

Charles F. Zimmerman, Chief of Police of Buffalo, New York; Frank W. Tyler and Deputy Sheriff Wahl.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Separate Opinion: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company, Petitioner. vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

15

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, Mr. Justice Sanford, and Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. The Cambridge Loan and Building Company. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

46

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

48 vs. Court of Claims.

Robert H. Lenson.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the

24 vs. United States for the District of

Board of Public Utility Commissioners, New Jersey.

Joseph F. Autenrieth, Frederick W.

Gnichtel, Charles Brown , as

Members, etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,

Appellant,

54 vs.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners, Joseph F. Autenrieth, Frederick W. Gnichtel, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

John L. Shevenell and Helmar G. Josephson, Trustees,

Petitioners,

——, Original. vs.

James M. Morton, Jr., U. S. District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur E. Roberts and West End Lumber Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. The City of Detroit, The Common Council for the City of Detroit, Philip A. Callahan, et al. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

209

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and on motion to dismiss, affirm or advance which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur E. Roberts and West End Lumber Company, Petitioners, vs. The City of Detroit, The Common Council for the City of Detroit, Philip A. Callahan, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

209

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Douglas, Petitioner, vs. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on January 14, 1929.

312

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon G. Godley
and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting
the Transit Commission, Appellants,
159 vs. ORDER
Interborough Rapid Transit Company and
Manhattan Railway Company.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument on January 14, 1929, with the same limitations as to the time of argument and the number of counsel as in the original hearing; that complete new briefs be filed, and that the old briefs heretofore filed shall not be used; that the new briefs shall conform to the rules of this Court, be compact, logically arranged with proper headings, concise, and free from burdensome, irrelevant, and immaterial matter; the appellants shall prepare and file their briefs on or before December 17, 1928. The appellees shall prepare and file their briefs on or before January 2, 1929, and the appellants shall file reply briefs on or before January 9, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Journeymen Stone Cutters Association
of North America, Michael W. Mitchell,
and Joseph Wall, Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of
72 vs. the United States for the Southern
The United States of America. District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Myers Parker, John C. Myers,
Helen Myers Miller, et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
52 vs.
The Tax Commission of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Myers Parker, John C. Myers,
Helen Myers Miller, et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
53 vs.
The Tax Commission of Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sutter Butte Canal Company,
Plaintiff in error,
403 vs.
The Railroad Commissionof the
State of California.

The Court find that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

The Coast Lumber Company, Lillian Dunn and Jess Dunn, Appellants, vs. M. W. Johnson, C. A. Phillips, R. L. Mohler, et al., etc.

408

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Coast Lumber Company, Lillian Dunn and Jess Dunn, Petitioners, vs. M. W. Johnson, C. A. Phillips, R. L. Mohler, et al., etc.

408

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, Appellant,

464 vs.

Harold E. West, Chairman and J. Frank Harper and Stewart Purcell, Members, Constituting the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harold E. West, Chairman and J. Frank Harper and Stewart Purcell, Members, Constituting the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Appellants,

465 vs.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harold E. West, Chairman and J. Frank Harper and Stewart Purcell, Members, Constituting the Public Service Commission of Maryland, Petitioners,

465 vs.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur J. Karnuth, United States Director of Immigration and Charles Dreher, Inspector in Charge, United States Immigration Service, Petitioners,

198 vs.

United States of America, on the petition of Preston M. Albro, as Attorney for Mary Cook and Antonio Danelon.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted. The order heretofore entered denying the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case is revoked, and a writ of certiorari herein is granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur J. Karnuth, United States Director of Immigration and Charles Dreher, Inspector in Charge United States Immigration Service, Petitioners,
198 vs.
United States of America, on the petition of Preston M. Albro, as Attorney for Mary Cook and Antonio Danelon.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky, Petitioner,
481 vs.
A. J. a. Alexander.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
484 vs.
Rosika Schwimmer.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George M. Emmanuel,
Petitioner,
319 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Shevenell and Helmar G. Josephson, Trustees,
Petitioners,
476 vs.
George J. Kelly, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Everlastik, Inc.,
Petitioner,
400 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward P. Lupper and Frederick
M. Remich, a co-partnership
doing business as Lupper and Remich, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

433 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Fajardo Sugar Company of
Porto Rico, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
472 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
Frederick G. Holcomb, Auditor of of Appeals for the First Circuit.
Porto Rico.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hyman Huebschman, doing business under the name and style of Ritz Perfume Company, Petitioner,
475 vs.
Pinaud, Incorporated.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puget Sound Power & Light Company, Petitioner,
478 vs.
J. G. Von Herberg, City of Seattle, Ed. L. Terry, as Treasurer, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Grace C. Mitchell Johnson, as Administratrix of the Estate of James E. F. Nexson, deceased. Petitioner,
480 vs.
Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

The New York Trust Company
and John F. Downing, Trustees,
Petitioners,
486 vs.
Continental and Commercial Trust
and Savings Bank, and Edward F.
Swinney, Trustees, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William M. LeMoyne,
Petitioner,
487 vs.
W. Espy Curtis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District, State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the First District, State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. W. Woolworth Co., Petitioner,
489 vs.
Clifford W. Calkins.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. & J. Sloane Manufacturing Co., Petitioner,
493 vs.
Armstrong Cork Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
494 vs.
Pillsbury Flour Mills Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupo n had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
6, Original, vs.
The State of Texas,
Defendant.
The United States,
Intervenor.

It appearing that the clerk duly transmitted a copy of the order of October 29, 1928, to the Attorney General of each of the States of Oklahoma and Texas and to the Attorney General of the United States;

And the State of Oklahoma and the United States having severally responded to the said order by showing that they have no objection to the destruction of the books of accounts, records, and files of the receivership in this cause heretofore stored with the Security Storage Company, of Washington, D. C., and the State of Texas having failed to make any response to said order or to show cause against such proposed destruction;

It is now ordered that the clerk of this Court shall destroy all the books of account, records, and files of the receivership in this cause heretofore stored with the Security Storage Company, of Washington, D. C., under the order of May 11, 1925, and that the clerk report to the Court the fact of such destruction.

It is also ordered that the clerk pay any expense incurred in effecting such destruction and also pay any accrued charge owing to the Security Storage Company on account of the storage of such books, records, and files up to the time of such destruction—such payments to be made out of the special fund in his custody established and maintained under the general order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Amos Farris,
Appellant,
548 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"In the District Court of the United States in and for the District of Idaho, Southern Division.

In the Matter of the Application of Amos Farris for Writ of Habeas Corpus	:	No. 1549 CERTIFICATE

I, W. D. McReynolds, clerk of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that on June 15, 1928, Solon B. Clark, attorney for petitioner Amos Farris, filed in the above entitled court a notice of appeal from the judgment of the court denying a writ of habeas corpus for said Amos Farris and that said notice of appeal is in words and figures as follows, to-wit:

'To the United States of America, Appellee, and/or

H. E. Ray, United States District Attorney.

You and each of you will please take notice that the petitioner, Amos Farris, in the above entitled cause, hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States from the order entered in the above-entitled cause on the 15th day of June, 1928, and that the certified transcript of record will be filed in the said Appellate Court within thirty days from the filing of this notice.

SOLON B. CLARK

Attorney for petitioner.

Due service and receipt of a copy hereof is admitted this 15th day of June, 1928.

H. E. RAY,

United States District Attorney'

and I further certify that on said June 15, 1928, Charles C. Cavanah, Judge of said above-named court, made and filed an order in said matter, in words and figures as follows, to-wit:

' And now on this 15th day of June, 1928, comes Amos Farris, petitioner in the above-entitled cause, and presents to the Court his petition for appeal from the United States Supreme Court, to the United States District Court, District of Idaho, Southern Division, and certain assignment of errors attached to said petition , and moves the Court to grant the prayer of said petition and allow an appeal, as prayed for.

It is ordered by the Court that said appeal be, and it is hereby allowed, and that said appeal shall operate as a supersedeas and that no further proceedings shall be had in this cause in this Court until the final determination thereof in the said Supreme Court of the United States, upon the filing and the approval by the Court of a bond in the penal sum of Twenty-five hundred dollars and no/100 ($2,500.00) for said petitioner, and in addition thereto an obligation upon the part of said petitioner in the sum of Three Hundred Dollars and no/100 ($300.00), to pay any and all costs which may be adjudged against him by said Supreme Court of the United States.

It is further ordered that said petitioner shall be released until action on said appeal by the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is further ordered that said petitioner shall and may have twenty days from the signing of this order within which to prepare, have approved and file said bond.

Done in open court this 15th day of June, 1928.

CHARLES C. CAVANAH

District Judge'

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said court, this 31st day of October, 1928.

(SEAL) (Signed) W. D. McREYNOLDS

Clerk of the U. S. District Court."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 11th rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause, be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Shanker Laxman Gokhale,

Petitioner,

361 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the judgments of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York and of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in this cause be vacated and set aside, and that the cause be remanded to the said District Court with direction to dismiss the bill of complaint;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, and on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said District Court and the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same are hereby, vacated and set aside; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the

The United States of America, Petitioner, 375 vs. California Cooperative Canneries.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.
The United States of America, Appellant, 513 vs. American Livestock Commission Company, Lewis Barefoot, etc.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the appellant.
Ida Rosoff and Lena Schultz, Petitioners, 499 vs. The United States of America.	On consideration of the motion by counsel for the respondent to defer the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause for one week, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
T. Tomich, Harry F. Scott, and H. Mulberger, Appellants, 14 vs. Union Trust Company, a corporation, Spokane & Eastern Trust Company, a corporation.	The motion for further extension of time to comply with paragraph 2 of rule 13 per stipulation of counsel was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Walsh in behalf of Mr. John A. Shelton.
Benjamin Russell, J. M. Steverson, T. C. Russell, et al., Petitioners, 58 vs. The United States of America.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Godfry L. Munter, leave was granted to file a brief of Clarence M. Goodwin, as amicus curiae, herein.

The Cudahy Packing Company, a corporation, Appellant, 278 vs. Jay Grant Hinkle, Secretary, etc.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dean G. Acheson for the appellant.
Benjamin Russell, J. M. Steverson, T. C. Russell, et al., Petitioners, 58 vs. The United States of America.	On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. J. C. Murphy, leave was granted to file a brief of J. C. Murphy, as amicus curiae.
Katherine C. Roe, Plaintiff in error, 63 vs. The State of Kansas on the relation of William A. Smith, Attorney General Lincoln and Lee University of Kansas City, et al.	The motion to dismiss the writ of error herein as to defendant the Lincoln and Lee University of Kansas City was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leslie J. Lyons in that behalf.
The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company et al., Appellants, 131 vs. The United States of America et al. The United States of America et al., Appellants, 132 vs. The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company, et al.	The motion for leave to file a brief of the National Conference on Valuation of American Railroads and to participate in the oral argument as amicus curiae, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald R. Richberg in support of the motion and by Mr. Robert H. Kelley for the St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Co. in opposition thereto.
In Re. Disbarment of John H. Adriaans. No. ---.	The motion to vacate the order of disbarment entered June 1, 1926, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Adriaans pro se.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
State of Indiana et al.

The return to the rule to show cause of James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, et al. was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank D. Hatfield in that behalf.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
State of Indiana et al.

The return to the rule to show cause of State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur L. Gilliom in that behalf.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
—, Original vs.
State of Indiana et al.

The motion for leave to file an amended bill of complaint was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford E. Smith for the complainant and leave granted complainant to file a brief in reply to the returns to the rule to show cause within 10 days.

John Brosnan, Jr.,
Petitioner,
—, [illegible] vs.
George E. Martin, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Brosnan, Jr., pro se.

Security National Bank of Watertown, South Dakota, Appellant,
424 vs.
Iver Twinde et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Perce L. Louchs for the appellant.

Theodore J. Dimitry, A. T. Pattison, et al., Appellants,
430 vs.
Mrs. Lillian Lewis et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. A. Wallace for the appellants.

Etamar A. Mower,
Appellant,
438 vs.
The State Department of Health of Connecticut.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. O'Keefe for the appellant.

Inter-City Coach Company,
Appellant,
81 vs.
Abram L. Atwood, Frederick A. H. Bodington, John W. Hanley, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Mayes,
Petitioner,
531 vs.
The Industrial Accident Board of the State of Michigan et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Mayes, pro se.

Robert Percy Lofton,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
The State of Mississippi.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Robert Young, Jr., for the petitioner.

Mrs. J. B. Ellis, Petitioner, 178 vs. Associated Industries Insurance Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Carrigan for the petitioner.
Carson Petroleum Company, Petitioner, 306 vs. Leon C. Vial, Sheriff and Tax Collector, etc., et al.	Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry P. Sneed for the respondents.
Hardware Underwriters and National Hardware Service Corporation, Petitioners, 371 vs. The United States.	The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Brooks and Mr. Daniel V. Howell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. E. G. Davis, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.
Era W. Moore (formerly Era W. Cobb) joined by her husband C. G. Moore, et al., Petitioners, 385 vs. A. H. Downing, Tax Collector of Stephens County, Texas, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, Eleventh Supreme Judicial District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Walter Cooke for the petitioners.

Nels S. Nyberg, as Administrator of Estate of Peter Bergman, deceased, Petitioner,
432 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marvin Farrington and Mr. Harry Faber White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Dwight E. Rorer for the respondent.

Leona Ramos y Fajardo et al., Petitioners,
473 vs.
Francisco Icasiano y Bello et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jose Abad Santos for the petitioners.

Cline Electric Manufacturing Co., et al., Petitioners,
496 vs.
G. A. Edward Kohler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the UnitedStates Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wesley G. Carr and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioners, and by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. Edw. W. Everett, and Mr. Donald M. Carter for the respondent.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
497 vs.
Kelly Webb.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Strickling for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. A. Lilly for the respondent.

H. D. Brown, E. W. Allison, et al., Petitioners,
498 vs.
A. J. Veigel, as Commissioner of Banks of the State of Minnesota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Monteville J. Brown and Mr. William H. Oppenheimer for the petitioners.

Ideal Cup Corporation, Petitioner,
500 vs.
Tulip Cup Corporation and United States Machine Mfg. Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hans v Briesen for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Austin Stone for the respondent.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation and Anthony G. Fleck, Petitioners,
501 vs.
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Morgan and Mr. Alan M. Johnson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Stephen J. Cox and Mr. Lynn A. Williams for the respondent.

Dallas W. Dietrich, doing business under the firm name and style of Atlantic Seaboard Flour Mills, Petitioner,
502 vs.
United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard B. Cavanagh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Randolph M. Valz, Arthur Valz, et al., Petitioners,
503 vs.
Sheepshead Bay Bungalow Corporation et al.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. George E. Brower, Mr. Morgan J. O'Brien, and Mr. John Vance Hewitt for the respondent.

Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, owner of the Ferryboat "Cranford," Petitioner,
505 vs.
Eastern Steamship Line,, as owner of the S. S. "Cumberland."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Pierre M. Brown and Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith and Mr. Henry M. Hewitt for the respondent.

Gulf Refining Company, Petitioner,
506 vs.
Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira A. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Richardson Lyeth for the respondent.

Winford P. Larson, Petitioner,
507 vs.
David Crowther.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Amasa C. Paul for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. A. Whiteley for the respondent.

Radio Corporation of America,
Petitioner,
508 vs.
Arthur D. Lord, Receiver in Equity for the DeForest Radio Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thurlow M. Gordon, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, Mr. John W. Davis, and Mr. James P. Sheffield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the respondents.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York,
Petitioner,
509 vs.
Aachen & Munich Fire Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Cannon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hartwell Cabell for the respondent.

International Indemnity Company,
Petitioner,
510 vs.
C. C. Lehman and C. W. Lehman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland and Mr. Robert N. Golding for the petitioner, and by Mr. Franklin D. Jones for the respondents.

H. C. Huckaby,
Petitioner,
516 vs.
W. H. Clark, Receiver in Bankruptcy of the Kramer Mercantile Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Finis E. Riddle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles L. Yancey and Mr. W. C. Hughes for the respondent.

Societe Anonyme D'Armement D'Industrie et de Commerce as Owner and Claimant of the steamship "Sunoco," Petitioner, vs. James McWilliams Blue Line, Inc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. Leonard J. Matteson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Anthony V. Lynch, Jr., and Mr. W. H. McGrann for the respondents.
520	
The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Harry Whyel and George Whyel.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.
525	
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Fort Smith, Subiaco & Rock Island Railroad Company, Appellants, vs. Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and continued by Mr. H. H. Larrimore for the appellee.
19	

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland, Associate Justices.

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Lawler, It is ordered that P. E. Boslaugh, Esquire, of Hastings, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Meeers, It is ordered that Clifford Shoemaker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Cohen, It is ordered that Clarence F. Corner, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles T. Cates, Jr., It is ordered that Albert Williams, Esquire, of Lebanon, State of Tennessee; W. F. Barry, Jr., Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee; and L. D. Smith, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. H. Richmond, It is ordered that Samuel H. Riggs, Esquire, of Ann Arbor, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace R. Lamb, It is ordered that Rush H. Williamson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wood, It is ordered that John Bucerzan, Esquire, of East Chicago, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell, It is ordered that C. Denison Cherry, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission,
and Fort Smith, Subiaco & Rock
Island Railroad Company,
Appellants,

19 vs.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. H. H. Larrimore for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. James B. McDonough for appellant Fort Smith, Subiaco, and Rock Island R. R. Co.

J. Robert Cogen,
Petitioner,
89 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Sanford H. Cohen for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Botany Worsted Mills,
Petitioner,
31 vs.
The United States.

This case was reargued by Mr. Nathan A. Smyth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company, Petitioner,
91 vs.
Louis Hubshman, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company;
Harry Oriel and Joseph Confino, individually and as members of the firm of Oriel, Confino & Co.,
Petitioners,
92 vs.
William E. Russell, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Oriel, Confino & Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Archibald Palmer for the petitioner in No. 91, continued by Mr. George L. Cohen for the respondent in No. 91, and by Mr. Hugo Levy for the petitioner, in No. 92.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Spencer Gordon, It is ordered that Waldron M. Ward, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Bride, It is ordered that David F. Lee, Esquire, of Binghamton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Co., Petitioner,
91 vs.
Louis Hubshman, Trustee, etc.
Harry Oriel and Joseph Confino, individually, etc.,
Petitioner,
92 vs.
William E. Russell, Trustee etc.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Hugo Levy for the petitioner in No. 92, and concluded by Mr. Benjamin Siegel for the respondent in No. 92.

Surplus Trading Company,
Plaintiff in error,
33 vs.
J. M. Haynie, as Sheriff, etc.

This case was argued on the motion to dismiss by Mr. Charles D. Cherry for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Sam T. Poe for the defendant in error. Motion to dismiss denied.

Argued by Mr. Charles D. Cherry for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Sam T. Poe for the defendant in error.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Corporation in Nebraska and E. P. Boyer Lumber Company & Coal Company, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
50 vs.
Nebraska State Railway Commission.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles F. McLaughlin for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. Aman Raymond for certain plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Hugh La Master for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that E. V. Littlefield, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Edwin Sawyer Hall, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred L. Geiger, It is ordered that Philip U. Gayaut, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joe Tin Lun, etc., et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
74 vs.
W. F. Bond, State Sup't. of Education, et al.

This case was continued until March 1, 1929.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Corporation in Nebraska et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
50 vs.
Nebraska State Railway Commission.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles L. Mclaughlin for the plaintiffs in error on the question of jurisdiction. The Court declined to hear further argument.

John W. Gleason, etc.,
Petitioner,
51 vs.
Seaboard Air Line Railway Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward Brennan for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Ormonde Hunter for the respondent.

Benjamin Russell et al.,
Petitioners,
58 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Douglas Arant and Mr. William S. Pritchard for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. C. Davis for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Broussard, It is ordered that Frank O. Chavez, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that H. O. Brown, Esquire, of Punta Gorda, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmont B. Hazard, It is ordered that Charles B. McInnis, Esquire, of Repton, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard F. Bresee, It is ordered that L. Karlton Mosteller, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Sidney C. Brown, Jr., Esquire, of Lakeland, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chas. J. Williamson, It is ordered that Philip M. Payne, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hammers, It is ordered that David Ezzell McRae, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace R. Lamb, It is ordered that Ernest W. Clemens, Esquire, of San Antonio , State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, It is ordered that James C. Connell, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Beller, It is ordered that Albert F. Block, Esquire, of Davenport, State of Iowa , be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Floyd Kelsey,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

550 vs. the State of Ohio.

The State of Ohio.

Mr. James C. Connell, counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"SUPREME COURT OF OHIO, JANUARY TERM, A. D. 1927.

No. 20724

Transcript of Docket & Journal Entries

Floyd Kelsey,

Plaintiff in error,

vs.

The State of Ohio, Defendant in error.

Action: Motion for leave to file petition in error to the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County.

Error to the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County.

Attorneys: For Plaintiff in error, John F. Curry, O. D. Eshelman, Cleveland, Ohio.

For Defendant in error: E. C. Stanton, James C. Connell, Cleveland.

Memoranda of Pleadings, etc., filed, writs issued, Judgments, orders and decrees.

1927
August 4th Motion for leave to file petition in error, notice and proof of service filed.

Nov. 16th Motion for leave to file petition in error to the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County;
Overruled-Journal 31-Page 200.

23rd Application for rehearing, notice and acknowledgement filed.

Dec. 4th Petition in error and precipe for summons filed.
6th Rehearing denied - Journal No. 31-page 210.
1928 -Jan'y.11th Motion by defendant in error to dismiss petition in error as of right: Sustained: Journal No. 31-page 256.
" Petition in error as of right dismissed; no debatable constitutional question involved. Journal 31, page 260.
23rd Petition for writ of error and order allowing same, signed by C. T. Marshall, Chief Justice, filed.
" Writ of error filed.
" Assignment of errors filed.
30th Citation and proof of service filed.
" Bond, $6,000.00, signed by Floyd H. Kelsey, principal, and Royal Rhodes, Edna Rhodes, Ira A. Kelsey, Annabelle Kelsey, Myron I. Kelsey, Alice B. Kelsey, as sureties, filed and approved, by C. T. Marshall, Chief Justice.
Feb. 1st Precipe filed-proof of service filed.
18th Certified transcript of record and all papers sent to Clerk of United States Supreme Court, Washington D. C.

Transcript of Journal Entries.

Wednesday, November 16, 1927.
Motion for leave to file petition in error to the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County.

It is ordered by the Court that this motion be, and the same hereby is, overruled. Journal No. 31-page-

Wednesday, January 11, 1928

Motion by defendant in error to dismiss petition in error as of right.
It is ordered by the Court that this motion be, and the same hereby is, sustained. Journal No. 31-page 256.

Wednesday, January 11, 1928

Error to the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County.
This cause came on to be heard upon the transcript of the record of the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County, upon the motion of the defendant in error to dismiss the petition in error filed as of right herein, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged that said petition in error be, and the same hereby is, dismissed for the reason no debatable constitutional question is involved in said cause.
It is further ordered and adjudged that the defendant in error recover from plaintiff in error its costs herein expended, taxed at $_____.
Ordered, that a special mandate be sent to the Court of Common Pleas of Cuyahoga County, to carry this judgment into execution.
Ordered, that a copy of this entry be certified to the Clerk of the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County, 'for entry.'

Journal No. 31-page 260.

Tuesday, December 6, 1927

Application for rehearing.

It is ordered by the Court that application for rehearing in the above cause be, and the same hereby, is denied.

Journal No. 31-page 210.

STATE OF OHIO,

City of Columbus, ss:

I, Seba H. Miller, Clerk of the Supreme Court of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the docket and journal entries of said Court in the case of Floyd Kelley, plaintiff in error vs. State of Ohio, defendant in error, as appears by the Minute Books and Journals of said Court;

I further certify that on January 23, 1927, Honorable C. T. Marshall, Chief Justice, allowed a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States to the Supreme Court of Ohio, in said cause, and that pursuant thereto on February 18, 1927 a duly certified transcript of the record, petition for writ of error, order allowing the writ, assignment of errors and all other papers relating thereto were forwarded by me to the Clerk of the U. S. Supreme Court at Washington, D. C. I further certify that no Mandate or Entry has been received, showing disposition of the cause by the U. S. Supreme Court.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the Seal of said Supreme Court this 19th day of November, 1928.
(Signed) Seba H. Miller

(Seal)

Clerk, Supreme Court of Ohio."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 11th Rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of the State of Ohio to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

John Slaker, Administrator, etc., Appellant, 61 vs. Charles O'Connor et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. P. E. Boslaugh for the appellant, The Court declined to hear further argument.
Katherine C. Roe, Plaintiff in error, 63 vs. The State of Kansas on the relation of William A. Smith, Attorney General, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. T. F. Railsback for for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Albert S. Williams, Commissioner, etc., Appellants, 64 vs. The Standard Oil Company of Louisiana. Albert S. Williams, Commissioner, etc., Appellants, 65 vs. The Texas Company.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Charles T. Cates, Jr., for the appellants; continued by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. H. Dent Minor for the appellee in No. 64; by Mr. John B. Keeble for the appellee in No. 65; and concluded by Mr. James J. Lynch for the appellants.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, 70 vs. Morgan L. Davis, as Administrator, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Henry E. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Wolfe for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court [illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D. McKenney, It is ordered that Norman A. Emery, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, It is ordered that William Henry O'Brien, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Kemp, It is ordered that Bartlett E. Cushing, Esquire, of Marion, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin L. Wilson, It is ordered that Rees H. Davis, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James H. Rogers, It is ordered that James N. Sabin, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clement L. Bouve, It is ordered that Harvey A. Basham, Esquire, of Shawnee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Pacific Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
49 vs.
Carl G. Peterson.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The United States of America, as owner of the Steam Collier "Proteus,"
Petitioner,
21 vs.
Commonwealth and Dominion Line, Ltd., as Owner of the Steamship "Port Philip."

It is ordered that this case be assigned for argument on Wednesday, January 2, 1929, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. Tomich, Harry F. Scott and H. Mulberger, Appellants,
14 vs.
Union Trust Company, a corporation, Spokane & Eastern Trust Company, a corporation.

On Consideration of the motion to extend the time to comply with paragraph 2 of Rule 13,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the time is extended to January 2, 1929.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission,
355 vs. Appellants,
Anchor Coal,Company et al.;

Barton Coal Company, et al., Appellants,
356 vs.
Anchor Coal Company et al.;

Pittsburgh Operators' Lake Rate Committee et al., Appellants,
357 vs.
Anchor Coal Company et al.;

Baltimore and Ohio R. R. Company et al., Appellants,
358 vs.
Anchor Coal Company et al.

ORDER.

It is ordered that these cases be advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, February 18, 1929.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company et al.,
273 vs. Appellants,
The United States of America et al.

ORDER

It is ordered that this case be advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, February 25, 1929.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Sudahy Packing Company,
278 vs. Appellant,
Jay Grant Winkle, Secretary of State and John H. Dunbar, Attorney General of the State of Washington.

On Consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 7, 1929, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
California Cooperative Canneries.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 11, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
513 vs.
American Livestock Commission Co., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, March 5, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Co., et al., Appellants,
131 vs.
The United States of America et al.
The United States of America et al., Appellants,
132 vs.
The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Co. et al.

The motion submitted by Mr. Donald R. Richberg for leave to file a brief and to make oral argument as amicus curiae in these causes is granted, the time of the argument to be fixed by the Court when the cases are called.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

In Re: Disbarment of John H. Adriaans.

On consideration of the motion to revoke the order of disbarment herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John J. Brosnan, Jr., Petitioner,
——, Original. vs.
George E. Martin, Judge.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is ordered that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Mayes, Petitioner,
531 vs.
The Industrial Accident Board of the State of Michigan and The Consolidated Paper Co.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Mayes, Petitioner,
531 vs.
The Industrial Accident Board of the State of Michigan and The Consolidated Paper Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Robert Percy Lofton,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Percy Lofton,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Corporation in Nebraska and E. P. Boyer Lumber Company & Coal Company, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
50 vs.
Nebraska State Railway Commission.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Security National Bank of Water-
town, South Dakota, Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the
424 vs. State of South Dakota.
Iver Twinde, Pat Walsh, J. A. Kiley,
et al., etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Theodore J. Dimitry, A. T. Pattison
and H. P. Dart, Senior, Trustees, Appeal from the Supreme Court of
etc., Appellants, the State of Mississippi.
430 vs.
Mrs. Lillian Lewis, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Etamar A. Mower,
Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of
438 vs. Errors of the State of Connecticut.
The State Department of Health for
the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carson Petroleum Company,
Petitioner,
306 vs.
Leon C. Vial, Sheriff and Tax Collector of the Parish of St. Charles, R. A. DeBroca, Assessor for the Parish of St. Charles, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, is granted, And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf Refining Company,
Petitioner,
506 vs.
Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hardware Underwriters and National Hardware Service Corporation,
Petitioners,
371 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Era W. Moore (formerly Era W. Cobb)
joined by her husband C. G. Moore,
A.. N. Green, et al., Petitioners,
385 vs.
A. H. Downing, Tax Collector of
Stephens County, Texas, T. C.
Hefner, Tax Assessor of Stephens
County, Texas, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, 11th Supreme Judicial District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, 11th Supreme Judicial District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nels S. Nyberg, as Administrator
of the Estate of Peter Bergman,
deceased, Petitioner,
432 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leona Ramos y Fajardo, Bernardino Ramos
y Fajardo, et al., Petitioners,
473 vs.
Francisco Icasiano y Bello, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cline Electric Manufacturing Company, Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company and The Tribune Company, Petitioners, vs. G. A. Edward Kohler.

496 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Kelly Webb.

497 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. D. Brown, E. W. Allison, C. M. Anderson, et al., Petitioners, vs. A. J. Veigel, as Commissioner of Banks of the State of Minnesota.

498 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Ideal Cup Corporation,

Petitioner,

500 vs.

Tulip Cup Corporation and United States Machine Mfg. Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dallas W. Dietrich, doing business under the firm name and style of Atlantic Seaboard Flour Mills,

Petitioner,

502 vs.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Randolph M. Valz, Arthur Valz,
Adele Valz Gooch, et al.,
Petitioners,
503 vs.
Sheepshead Bay Bungalow Corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, owner of the Ferryboat "Cranford," Petitioner,
505 vs.
Eastern Steamship Lines, as owner of the S. S. "Cumberland."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Winford P. Larson,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
David Crowther.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Radio Corporation of America,
Petitioner,
508 vs.
Arthur D. Lord, Receiver in Equity for the DeForest Radio Company, Northern Manufacturing Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York,
Petitioner,
509 vs.
Aachen & Munich Fire Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Indemnity Company,
Petitioner,
510 vs.
C. C. Lehman and C. W. Lehman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. C. Huckaby,

Petitioner,

516 vs.

W. H. Clark, Receiver in Bankruptcy of the Kramer Mercantile Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Societe Anonyme D'Armenent D'Industrie et de Commerce, as owner and claimant of the Steamship "Sunoco", Petitioner,

520 vs.

James McWilliams Blue Line, Inc., and Bernhart Boordsen and Steamship "George H. Jones," etc.,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
526 vs.
The John Barth Company and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petition to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
90 vs.
The Northern Trust Company, as Executor, etc.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Elihu Root, Jr., leave was granted to file a brief of Elihu Root, Jr., as amicus curiae, herein.

The Brictson Manufacturing Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
——, vs.
H. E. Close, et al.
The Brictson Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
——, vs.
Mark J. Rosso, et al.
The Brictson Manufacturing Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
——, vs.
H. E. Close et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writs of certiorari in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben Jenkins for the petitioner.

Lancaster Iron Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
369 vs.
J. C. Penney-Gwinn Corporation, et al.

Lancaster Iron Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
370 vs.
J. C. Penney-Gwinn Corporation et al.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a rehearing out of time was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter E. Barton in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Merwin F. Wooten,
Appellant,
109 vs.
Brevard County, Florida.

The motion to pass this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Clark for the appellant in support of the motion, and by Mr. L. C. Crofton for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Ida Rosoff and Lena Schultz,
Petitioners,
499 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John T. Gale et al.,
Appellants,
426 vs.
Norfolk & Western Ry. Co., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Williams, Mr. Simeon Nash, and Mr. James I. Boulger for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. F. M. Rivinus and Mr. J. Hamilton Cheston for the appellees in opposition thereto.

McPherson Brothers Company,
Plaintiff in error,
439 vs.
Okanogan-Douglas Inter-County Bridge Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Peter McPherson for the plaintiff in error in support thereof.

Vermillion Mining Company,
Appellant,
459 vs.
Irene V. Fraser.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace Andrews and Mr. Wm. P. Belden for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. A. L. Austin for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Crete Mining Company,
Appellant,
460 vs.
Laura A. Day.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. P. Belden for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Fred W. Putnam for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Inland Steel Company,
Appellant,
461 vs.
Laura A. Day.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. P. Belden for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Fred W. Putnam for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Inland Steel Company,
Appellant,
462 vs.
H. S. Fryberger.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. P. Belden and Mr. Horace Andrews for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Harvey Hoshour for the appellee in opposition thereto.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Ry. Co., et al.,
Appellants,
466 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer Westlake for the appellants.

Ex Parte: Worcester County National Bank of Worcester, Appellant.
No. 469.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Newton D. Baker and Mr. Benj. F. Fiery for the appellant.

Frank D. Theobald, Victor M. Harper, et al.,
Plaintiffs in error,
474 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Fayette County, Ohio, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. W. Gearheart for the plaintiffs in error in support thereof, and by Mr. Ray H. Maddox for the defendants in error, in opposition thereto.

George Sambor and John J. Mullin, et al., etc., Appellants,
477 vs.
Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. Regan, Jr., for the appellants.

London Guarantee and Accident Co., Ltd., Appellant,
491 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leo C. Weiler for the appellant.

Renee Noel, Appellant,
492 vs.
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Charles W. Clagett and Mr. T. Howard Duckett for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Dewey County, South Dakota, Petitioner,
515 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank McNulty for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, and Mr. Pedro Capo-Rodriguez for the respondent.

St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railway Company, Petitioner,
518 vs.
Ivan F. Woods.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Howell for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Douglass for the respondent.

E. V. M. M. De Sousa et al., Petitioners,
521 vs.
Crocker First National Bank of San Francisco, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. T. C. Gregory for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward Mohfeld and Mr. Herbert W. Clark for the respondent.

Mike Vendetti, Petitioner,
522 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

Otto Kindlund and Mary Kindlund, Petitioners,
523 vs.
The State of Washington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Miller for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ewing D. Colvin for the respondent.

Daniel B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner, 527 vs. Henry Wilhelm Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.
Alexander F. Winters and Basil R. Crampton, Petitioners, 547 vs. Dent Hardware Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., for the petitioners.
The State of Colorado, Complainant, 14, Original vs. The State of Kansas et al.	This case was argued on the motion to dismiss by Mr. F. Dumont Smith for the defendant, the Finney County Water Users' Association; by Mr. John G. Egan for the defendant the State of Kansas; and by Mr. Fred A. Sabin and Mr. James G. Rogers for the complainant. Leave granted the State of Kansas to file supplemental brief by December 1.
W. A. Frost, doing business, etc., Appellant, 60 vs. Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Robert M. Rainey and Mr. Street B. Flynn for the appellant and by Mr. E. S. Ratliff for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Alva Edgar Steadman, Esquire, of Honolulu, Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abraham L. Gutman, It is ordered that Wm. Victor Goldberg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, was admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chase National Bank, etc., et al.,
77 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. L. L. Hamby, leave was granted to file a brief of L. L. Hamby, as amicus curiae, in this case.

Unadilla Valley Railway Company,
Petitioner,
73 vs.
Ernest Caldine, as Adm'r.,etc.

This case was argued by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. F. Lee for the respondent.

The Commercial Casualty Insurance Company,
75 vs.
The Consolidated Stone Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Reese H. Davis for the Commercial Casualty Insurance Co., and by Mr. Norman A. Emery for the Consolidated Stone Co.

E. Henry Weeme Company,
Plaintiff in error,
76 vs.
Ben Selling et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Guy C. H. Corliss for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Thomas Mannix for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Chase National Bank, etc., et al.,
77 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Dallas S. Townsend for the Chase National Bank, etc., et al., continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the United States, and by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the Chase National Bank, etc., et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wyndham R. Meredith, It is ordered that Bernard Meredith, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
90 vs.
The Northern Trust Co., as Executor, etc.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Russell L. Bradford, leave was granted to file a brief of Edward H. Blanc and Russell L. Bradford, as amici curiae, in this case.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas, Plaintiff in error, 88 vs. William W. Mars et al.	This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred Wallace, Mr. Charles C. Huff, and Mr. Joseph H. Barwise for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James A. Templeton and Mr. Robert L. Carlock for the defendants in error.
The Chase National Bank, etc., et al., 77 vs. The United States.	The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the Chase National Bank, etc., et al.
The United States, Petitioner, 78 vs. Amos D. Carver et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank E. Scott for the respondents.
Leo Salomon et al., Plaintiff in error, 79 vs. State Tax Commission of New York. Nettie I. Simonson et al., Plaintiffs in error, 80 vs. State Tax Commission of New York.	These cases were argued by Mr. Charles Angulo for the plaintiffs in error in No. 79, by Mr. Abraham L. Gutman for the plaintiffs in error, in No. 80, and by Mr. Seth T. Cole for the defendant in error.
J. Royal Snyder, Plaintiff in error, 82 vs. The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company.	This case was argued by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William H. Boyd and Mr. Thos. H. Hogsett for the defendant in error.

American Railway Express Company,
Plaintiff in error,
83 vs.
Fleishman, Morris & Co., Inc.,

American Railway Express Company,
Plaintiff in error,
84 vs.
Richmond Hardware Company.

American Railway Express Company,
Plaintiff in error,
85 vs.
C. T. Elliott, Inc.

American Railway Express Company,
Plaintiff in error,
86 vs.
L. M. Newcomb.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Wyndham R.Meredith for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that R. L. Davidson, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, and Fred A. Tillman, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel A. Lynn, It is ordered that C. K. Quin, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Woodward, It is ordered that Olive H. Rabe, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chas. J. Dodd, It is ordered that Henry J. Walsh, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex Parte:.
Alpha Shakeri,
——. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of habeas corpus, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lancaster Iron Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
369 vs.
J. C. Penney-Gwinn Corporation,
Robert H. McArdle, The Shoreland Co., Claimant, etc., et al.
Lancaster Iron Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
370 vs.
J. C. Penney-Gwinn Corporation,
Robert McArdle, The Shoreland Co.,
Claimant, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing in these causes beyond the time permitted by the rule, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merwin F. Wooten,
Appellant,
109 vs.
Brevard County, Florida.

On consideration of the motionto pass this case, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted until Monday, February 18th next, and the case is assigned for argument after the cases heretofore assigned for that day

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry F. Sinclair,
555 vs.
The United States of America.

This criminal case upon the docket is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Brictson Manufacturing Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
—— vs.
H. E. Close et al.
The Brictson Manufacturing Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
—— vs.
Mark J. Rosso, et al.,
The Brictson Manufacturing Company, a corporation, Petitioner,
—— vs.
H. E. Close, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writs of certiorari in these causes in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Kentucky, Complainant,
——, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, James Dunne Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, et al.

On consideration of the returns to the rules to show cause herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that leave be granted to file the original bill of complaint and the amended bill of complaint in this cause, and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, February 18, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John T. Gale, Harry B. Snyder,
Frederick L. Gardner, et al.,
Appellants,
426 vs
Norfolk & Western Railway Company
and Virginia Holding Corporation.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John T. Gale, Harry B. Snyder,
Frederick L. Gardner, et al.,
Petitioners,
426 vs.
Norfolk and Western Railway Company
and Virginia Holding Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McPherson Brothers Company,

Plaintiff in error,

439 vs.

Okanogan-Douglas Inter-County Bridge Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

McPherson Brothers Company,

Petitioner,

439 vs.

Okanogan-Douglas Inter-County Bridge Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vermillion Mining Company,

Appellant,

459 vs.

Irene V. Fraser.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Crete Mining Company,

Appellant,

460 vs.

Laura A. Day.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Inland Steel Company,

Appellant,

461 vs.

Laura A. Day.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Inland Steel Company,

Appellant,

462 vs.

H. B. Fryberger.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank D. Theobald, Victor M. Harper, Ivah M. Harper, et al.,

Plaintiffs in error.

474 vs.

The Board of County Commissioners of Fayette County, Ohio, and Glenn M. Pine, County Auditor of Fayette County, Ohio.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Sambor and John J. Millin,
et al., for themselves and on
behalf of the City of Philadelphia,

Appellants,

477 vs.

Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company;
and William D. B. Ainey, et al.,
jointly and severally as members of
the Public Service Commission of
Pennsylvania.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby, dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Renee Noel,

Appellant,

492 vs.

Washington Suburban Sanitary
Commission and J. Forrest Walker,
Treasurer of Montgomery County.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland; and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. Henry Wemme Company,

Plaintiff in error,

76 vs.

Ben Selling, Dr. Allen F. Noyes,
Edgar H. Sensenich, et al., etc.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Royal Snyder,

Plaintiff in error,

82 vs.

The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company et al.,

Appellants,

466 vs.

The United States of America.

Ex Parte:. Worcester County National Bank of Worcester,

469 Appellant,

London Guarantee and Accident Company, Ltd., Appellant,

491 vs.

In these cases the Court find that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas, et al.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the bill of complaint in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice to any question, and with leave to the defendants to answer within ninety days.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander F. Winters and Basil R. Crampton, Petitioners,
547 vs.
Dent Hardware Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. J. B. Ellis,
Petitioner,
178 vs.
Associated Industries Insurance Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dewey County, South Dakota, Petitioner,
515 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railway Co., Petitioner,
518 vs.
Ivan F. Woods.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. V. M. R. DeSousa and Leung Yan Po, doing business as copartners under the firm name and style of DeSousa & Co., Petitioners,
521 vs.
Crocker First National Bank of San Francisco, substituted for the Crocker National Bank of San Francisco.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mike Vendetti,

Petitioner,

522 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Otto Kindlund and Mary Kindlund,

Petitioners,

523 vs.

The State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

The Court will take a recess from Monday, December 10th next, to Wednesday, January 2nd, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Percy Lofton,
Petitioner,
538 vs.
The State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner to withdraw temporarily from the files the certified transcript of record in this cause, to be transmitted to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, but to be returned to the files of this Court within one month from this date, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hart Refineries,
Appellant,
490 vs.
The State of Montana.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Patterson for the appellant.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
513 vs.
American Livestock Commission Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan, and Mr. H. B. Teegarden for the appellant.

Charles Sawyear, Oscar Waller, et al.,
Petitioners,
517 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
524 vs.
Millie R. Jones.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter L. Clark for the petitioner.

Concrete Mixing & Conveying Company,
Petitioner,
528 vs.
R. C. Storrie & Company.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lynn A. Williams, Mr. Clifford C. Bradbury, Mr. Albert G. McCaleb, and Mr. Stephen J. Cox for the petitioner.

Herbert Day,
Petitioner,
542 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will Steel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

American Railway Express Company,
Plaintiff in error,
83 vs.
Fleishmann, Morris & Company, Inc.
American Railway Express Company
Plaintiff in error,
84 vs.
Richmond Hardware Company.
American Railway Express Company,
Plaintiff in error,
85 vs.
C. T. Elloitt, Inc.
American Railway Express Company,
Plaintiff in error,
86 vs.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Wyndham R. Meredith for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument. Leave granted counsel for plaintiff in error to file petition for writs of certiorari within 10 days.

J. F. Lawrence et al.,
Appellants,
99 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.

This case was argued by Mr. C. B. Ames for the appellants, and by Mr. C. B. Stuart for the appellee.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
305 vs.
Fruit Growers Express Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the appellant, and by Mr. William S. Dalzell for the appellee.

Allie E. Lewis et al.
Petitioners,
182 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. R. L. Davidson for the petitioners,

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft. Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Russell L. Bradford, It is ordered that Henry C. Eldert and Rollin Browne, Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Joseph Gordon Collins, Esquire, of Gainesville, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jay Leo Rothschild, It is ordered that Alexander L. Strouse, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Thompson, It is ordered that Albert L. Rabb, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Benjamin Stewart Crow, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Dickstein, It is ordered that Maximilian Bader, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that Ethel M. Proffitt, and J. A. Logan Stephenson, Esquire, of Okemah, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard T. Rives, It is ordered that Robert E. Steiner, Jr., Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. J. Donovan, It is ordered that Solon J. Carter, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Allie E. Lewis et al.,

Petitioners,

182 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. R. L. Davidson for the petitioners,.

Abraham Braunstein,

Plaintiff in error, and appellant,

352 vs.

The People of the State of New York on the complaint of Gertrude E. McCarthy.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Jay Leo Rothschild for the plaintiff in error and appellant. The argument was temporarily suspended.

W. D. Manley,

Appellant,

429 vs.

The State of Georgia.

This case was argued by Mr. Marion Smith and Mr. W. T. Colquitt for the appellant, and by Mr. Reuben R. Arnold for the appellee.

Abraham Braunstein,

Plaintiff and error and appellant,

382 vs.

The People of the State of New York, on the complaint of Gertrude E. McCarthy.

The argument of this case was resumed by Mr. Jay Leo Rothschild for the plaintiff in error and appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Alice Barbee Wick et al.,

Plaintiffs in error,

87 vs.

The Superior Court of the State of Washington, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Alice Barbee Wick, Schuyler J. Gray, and Dora Gray,

Plaintiffs in error,

87 vs.

The Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for the County of Chelan; The Honorable W. O. Parr, Judge, and Chelan Electric Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector, etc.,

Petitioner,

90 vs.

The Northern Trust Co., as Executor, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. T. H. Lewis for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1928

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Small, It is ordered that Edward A. Bosarge and Luther C. Johnson, Esquires, of Bartow, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, It is ordered that Maurice Albert Barancik, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred E. Crane, It is ordered that A. Harry Crane, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver E. Sweet, It is ordered that Howard C. Fuller, Esquire, of Pierre, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Boston Sand & Gravel Company,
Petitioner,
15 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. John T. Fowler, the mandate was granted in this case.

Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector, etc.,
Petitioner,
90 vs.
The Northern Trust Co., as Executor, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. T. H. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. P. Dammann, Jr. for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Wm. B. McIlvaine for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Co.,
Petitioner,
93 vs.
J. E. Johnson.

This case was argued by Mr. Robert E. Steiner, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard T. Rives for the respondent.

George Van Camp & Sons Company
94 vs.
American Can Company et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solon J. Carter for George Van Camp & Sons Company, and continued by Mr. William H. Thompson for the American Can Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward A. Harriman, It is ordered that Margaret Lambie, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Winter, It is ordered that James A. Greenwood, and Marion A. Kline, Esquires, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Stanley Hinricks, It is ordered that Harold H. Armstrong, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Stanley Hinricks, It is ordered that George H. Helm, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Forest D. Siefkin, It is ordered that Craig S. Atkins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Coleman L. Blease, It is ordered that John D. Long, Esquire, of Union, South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Fowler, It is ordered that James F. Gilliland, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis C. Cramton, It is ordered that Leo J. Carrigan, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George Van Camp & Sons Company,
94 vs.
American Can Company, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Henry H. Hornbrook for the Van Camp Packing Co., Inc., and concluded by Mr. Solon J. Carter for George Van Camp & Sons Co.

The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., Petitioner, 95 vs. Edgar M. Cranfell.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. T. Kinder for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.
The State Highway Commission of Wyoming, etc., et al., Petitioners, 96 vs. Utah Construction Company.	This case was argued by Mr. Marion A. Kline for the petitioners, and by Mr. Benjamin S. Crow for the respondent.
New York and New Jersey Water Co., et al., Appellants, 97 vs. Passaic Consolidated Water Co.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank S. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Pierce, It is ordered that Francis M. Miller, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Wm. Ramseyer, It is ordered that Lloyd Thurston, Esquire, of Osceola, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Wm. Ramseyer, It is ordered that Charles H. Elgin, Esquire, of Centerville, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevera, It is ordered that Ramon P. Mitra, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond Jones, It is ordered that Franklin E. Hardy, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that James A. Branch, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alford C. Hagerty, It is ordered that Riley A. Gwynn, Esquire, of Lovell, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New York and New Jersey Water Company and New Jersey Suburban Water Company, Appellants,
97 vs.
Passaic Consolidated Water Co.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Frederic J. Faulks for the appellee.

Lash's Products Company, Petitioner,
98 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. A. R. Serven for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

David A. Wright, Administrator of the Estate of Douglas B. Ellis, deceased, Petitioner,
100 vs.
Grand Trunk Railroad Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Harold W. Armstrong for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lee J. Carrigan for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
104 vs.
Florence E. Williams.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. William Kaufman for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred L. Geiger, It is ordered that Anne M. Goodall, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Frailey, It is ordered that Lee Forrest Denton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Frailey, It is ordered that Arther Skarry, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and hewas sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Schmertner, It is ordered that Joseph A. Gerardi, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, It is ordered that William Armstrong Hunter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that James T. Brady, Esquire, of Holbrook, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that W. Clifton Stone, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that James F. Sikes, Esquire, of Tarpon Springs, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Joseph E. Warner, Esquire, of Taunton, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward M. Reidy, It is ordered that Howard Hosmer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Security Mortgage Company,

Petitioner,

32 vs.

Charles A. Powers, Trustee in Bankruptcy for Florida Furniture Corporation, Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Northern Coal & Dock Company and General Accident, Fire & Life Assurance Corporation, Ltd., of Perth, Scotland, Petitioners,

41 vs.

Emma Strand and Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin for further

Unadilla Valley Railway Company,

Petitioner,

73 vs.

Ernest Caldine, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels, and Credits of Harold E. Caldine, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Hart Refineries,

Appellant,

490 vs.

The State of Montana.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

513 vs.

American Livestock Commission Company, Lewis Barefoot, etc., et al.

In this case the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

American Railway Express Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

83 vs. Appeals of the State of Virginia.

Fleischmann, Morriss & Co., Inc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

84 vs. Appeals of the State of Virginia.

Richmond Hardware Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

85 vs. Appeals of the State of Virginia.

G. T. Elliott, Inc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,

Plaintiff in error,

86 vs.

L. M. Newcomb.

In error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abraham Braunstein,

Plaintiff in error, and appellant,

352 vs.

The People of the State of New York on the complaint of Gertrude E. McCarthy.

In error to and appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error and appeal in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,

Petitioner,

93 vs.

J. E. Johnson.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Edgar M. Granfell. 95

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio, Eighth Judicial District.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio, Eighth Judicial District, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York and New Jersey Water Company and New Jersey Suburban Water Company, Appellants, vs. Passaic Consolidated Water Company. 97

Appeal from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation and Anthony G. Fleck, Petitioners, vs. Concrete Mixing and Conveying Company. 501

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ, the case to be heard with No. 528 as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Concrete Mixing & Conveying Company, Petitioner,
528 vs.
R. C. Storrie & Co.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ, the case to be heard with No. 501 as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioner,
524 vs.
Millie R. Jones.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. But the consideration of the cause shall be limited to the question whether the Circuit Court of Appeals erred in failing to review the rulings of the District Court in the progress of the trial, excepted to at the time and duly presented by a bill of exceptions.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Sawyear, Oscar Waller, George Andrae, et al., Petitioners,
517 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herbert Day, Petitioner,
542 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
399 vs.
The Maryland Casualty Co.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and he having moved the Court on behalf of the United States Circuit Judges for the Ninth Circuit for leave to withdraw the certificate and remand this cause to the said Circuit Court of Appeals,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company and Sinclair Refining Company, Petitioners,
545 vs.
City of Marysville, L. M. Cole, as Mayor, et al.

On motion made to the Court in behalf of the American Petroleum Institute by Mr. James M. Beck, leave was granted to file suggestions in support of the petition for writ of certiorari and to file a brief as amicus curiae on the merits should the petition be granted.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
6, Original. vs.
The State of Texas,
Defendant,
The United States of America,
Intervenor.

The report of the Clerk of the destruction of the receivership records in this case was submitted pursuant to the order of this Court of November 19, 1928, and ordered to be filed.

Exchange Drug Company,
Appellant,
511 vs.
J. D. McNeel, as Chairman, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Evins for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Charlie C. McCall and Mr. Richard T. Rives for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Ohio Oil Company,
Appellant,
314 vs.
E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Herold for the appellant.

Western & Atlantic Railroad,
Appellant,
519 vs.
Mrs. Mary E. Henderson and Maryland Casualty Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall and Mr. John L. Tye for the appellant.

A. J. Sartoris,
Petitioner,
512 vs.
Utah Construction Company et al.
Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
543 vs.
A. J. Sartoris.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace M. Street for the petitioner in No. 512 and respondent in No. 543, and by Mr. Thomas B. Dozier and Mr. Frank C. Cleary for the petitioner in No. 543 and respondent in No. 512.

Central New England Railway Company, Petitioner,
532 vs.
Boston & Albany Railroad Company, Assignor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry and Mr. George H. Fernald, Jr., for the respondent.

Young & Glenn, Inc., et al.,
Petitioner,
533 vs.
New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioners, and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the respondent.

Puritan Coal Mining Company, and E. H. Suender et al.,
Petitioners,
539 vs.
J. P. McCormick, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. J. Martin for the petitioners, and by Mr. F. W. Magrady for the respondent.

George M. Meek,
Petitioner,
540 vs.
George A. Beezer, et al.
John S. Ginter et al.,
Petitioners,
541 vs.
George A. Beezer, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis L. Orvis, Mr. Mortimer C. Rhone, and Mr. Arthur C. Dale for the petitioners.

Standard Oil Company and
Sinclair Refining Company,
Petitioners,
545 vs.
City of Marysville, L. M. Cole,
as Mayor, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Doran, Mr. Roy T. Osborn, Mr. Earle W. Evans, Mr. C. W. Martyne, and Mr. R. R. Vermillion for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Wednesday, January 2nd next at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 2, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. Mc Reynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver E. Sweet, It is ordered that Warren H. Wagner, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter L. Fisher, It is ordered that Arthur Fisher, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julio Cordova Davila, It is ordered that Ralph Smith, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Wickersham, It is ordered that Cornelius Doremus, Esquire, of Ridgewood, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis S. Sears, It is ordered that Irvin Stalmaster, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Dunbee, It is ordered that John M. Rose, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Charles Shepard II, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert MacC Barnes, Jr., It is ordered that Kenneth F. Simpson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United Fuel Gas Company, a Corporation and Warfield Natural Gas Company, a Corporation, Appellants,	Appeal from the District Court of
vs.	the United States for the Eastern
The Railroad Commission of Kentucky, Frank W. Burns, et al., etc., and Frank E. Daugherty, Attorney General of Kentucky.	District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Concurring: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

United Fuel Gas Company,

Appellant,

4 vs.

The Public Service Commission of West Virginia, I. Wade Coffman and C. E. Nethken, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Concurring: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, James K. Symmers, Grace B. Drake, et al., etc.,

77 vs.

The United States.

On a certificate from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that both questions must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said Court of Claims.

Mabel G. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois,

Petitioner,

90 vs.

The Northern Trust Company, as Executor Under the Last Will and Testament of A. C. Bartlett, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjuged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part and affirmed in part; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

John W. Gleason, doing Business as John W. Gleason Cotton Company,

Petitioner,

51 vs.

Seaborad Air Line Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Botany Worsted Mills,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Court

31 vs. of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Court

78 vs. of Claims.

Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner,

Clifford M. Carver, et al.

This cause came on to be heardon the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad

Company of Texas,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of the

88 vs. State of Texas.

William W. Mars and C. Bert Mars.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

International Shoe Company,

Plaintiff in error, In error to the Supreme Court of

12 vs. the State of Arkansas.

I. Pinkus, George Franklin, Sam

Dessent, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America, Inter-

state Commerce Commission, and Fort

Smith, Subiaco & Rock Island Railroad Appeal from the District Court of

Company, Appellants, the United States for the Western

19 vs. District of Arkansas.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Albert S. Williams, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Tennessee, L. D. Smith, Attorney General, and R. M. Atkinson, etc., Appellants,

64 vs.

The Standard Oil Company of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes.

Albert S. Williams, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Tennessee; L. D. Smith, Attorney General of the State of Tennessee, and R. M. Atkinson, etc., Appellants,

65 vs.

The Texas Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes.

George Van Camp & Sons Company,

94 vs.

American Can Company and The Van Camp Packing Company, Inc.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that both Questions must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

104 vs.

Florence E. Williams.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the judgment of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Roy O. West, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner, vs. Standard Oil Company. 71

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

J. Robert Cogen, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 89

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

J. F. Lawrence, C. C. Taylor, Edwin
Dabney, etc., et al., Appellants,
99 vs.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Benjamin Russell, J. M. Steverson,
F. C. Russell, Petitioners,
58 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

John Slaker, Administrator De Bonis Non of the Estate of John O'Connor, deceased, Appellant,
61 vs.
Charles O'Connor, Edward O'Connor, Mary L. O'Connor, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, and damages of one hundred and fifty dollars payable to the appellees.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Katherine C. Roe,
Plaintiff in error,
63 vs.
The State of Kansas on the Relation of William A. Smith, Attorney General; Lincoln and Lee University of Kansas City, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, and a penalty of two hundred dollars payable to the defendants in error.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The State Highway Commission of Wyoming, Consisting of Hyram Lingle, T. D. O'Neil, et al., Petitioners, 96 vs. Utah Construction Company. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the judgment of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Commercial Casualty Insurance Company, 75 vs. The Consolidated Stone Company. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Question 1 must be answered in the negative. An answer to Question No. 2 is rendered unnecessary by the answer to Question No. 1.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Lash's Products Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Court

98 vs. of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Courtthat the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

A. Leo Weil and Charles M. Thorp,
Doing business under the firm name
and style of Weil & Thorp, On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioners, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

59 vs., the Second Circuit.

Edward M. Neary.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with a direction to dismiss the plaintiff's action.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Exchange Drug Company,

Appellant,

511 vs.

J. D. McNeel, as Chairman of the State Tax Commission of Alabama, W. L. Harrison, F. H. Moore, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western & Atlantic Railroad,

Appellant,

519 vs.

Mrs. Mary E. Henderson and Maryland Casualty Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David A. Wright, Administrator of the
Estate of Douglas B. Ellis, deceased,
Petitioner,
100 vs.
Grand Trunk Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Royal Snyder,
Plaintiff in error,
82 vs.
The New York, Chicago & St. Louis
Railroad Company.

O R.D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment of dismissal heretofore entered in this cause on the 3rd day of December, 1928, is hereby vacated and set aside.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Royal Snyder,
Plaintiff in error,
82 vs.
The New York, Chicago & St. Louis
Railroad Company.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the ~~transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.~~ petition for a rehearing.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Ohio Oil Company,
Appellant,
514 vs.
E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central New England Railway Company,
Petitioner,
532 vs.
Boston & Albany Railroad Company, assignor for the benefit of New York Central Railroad Company, Assignee.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for Suffolk County, State of Massachusetts, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company and Sinclair Refining Company, Petitioners,
545 vs.
City of Marysville, L. N. Cole, as Mayor, R. E. Long, et al., etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. J. Sartoris,

Petitioner,

512 vs.

Utah Construction Company and Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,

Petitioner,

543 vs.

A. J. Sartoris.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Young & Glenn, Inc., et al.,

Petitioners,

533 vs.

New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Puritan Coal Mining Company and
E. H. Suender and Benjamin K.
Focht, Receivers, Thereof,
Petitioners,
539 vs.
J. P. McCormick, Collector of Taxes
for Coal Township, Northumberland County,
Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George R. Meek,
Petitioner,
540 vs.
George A. Beezer, George H. Yarnell
and Josephine Grenoble, Creditors, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John S. Ginter, John S. Dale,
Reed, O. Steely, Receivers, etc.,

Petitioners,

541 vs.

George A. Beezer, George H. Yarnell and Josephine Grenoble, Creditors, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

6, Original vs.

The State of Texas,
The United States of America,

Intervenor

REPORT

TO THE HONORABLE,

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES:

Report of the Clerk of Action Taken Under the Court's Order of November 19, 1928.

Pursuant to the order of this Court of November 19, 1928, entered in the above entitled cause, I beg to report the destruction of the books of account, records and files of the receivership therein specified, which were heretofore stored with the Security Storage Company of Washington, D. C.

These records, which were contained in a number of specially constructed wooden boxes and chests, were destroyed by fire in the furnaces of the above named storage company. The destruction was conducted under my direction and personally supervised by competent persons deputized by me. The empty boxes and chests were preserved and remain in my possession as Clerk of this Court.

I beg to report further that the charges accruing to the Security Storage Company on account of storage, which were not paid by the Receiver, together with the cost of destruction of these records, ~~as well as the cost of~~

[illegible], as well as the cost of delivery of the boxes and chests, have been paid by me, pursuant to the said order of November 19, 1928, from the "special fund in my custody, established and maintained by the general order of this Court of October 29, 1926".

Attached hereto are: (1) Affidavit of the persons who effectuated the destruction of these records; (2) An index of the receivership records, and (3) A receipt of the Security Storage Company of Washington, D. C. for the payment to it as hereinbefore specified.

Respectfully submitted

(Signed) Charles Elmore Cropley

Dated: December 10th, 1928. Clerk.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

6, Original vs. O R D E R

The State of Texas,

Defendant,

The United States of America,

Intervenor.

On examination of the report presented by the Clerk showing his compliance with the order of November 19, 1928, directing the destruction of the books of account, records, and files of the receivership therein specified, which were theretofore stored with the Security Storage Co., of Washington, D. C.; and it appearing from said report of the clerk and from the affidavits attached thereto and the attached schedules of the books, records, and files destroyed, that the clerk has fully complied with the order of November 19, 1928, and has paid the charge for storage and the expenses incident to such compliance amounting to $151.35.

It is now ordered that the report of the clerk in that behalf be approved and that he be allowed a credit in his accounts for the sum so paid out.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

Mr. Justice Van Devanter is hereby designated as the Associate Justice of this Court to act as a member of the commission to be known as "The United States Supreme Court Building Commission," under section 1 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the submission to Congress of preliminary plans and estimates of costs for the construction of a building for the Supreme Court of the United States," approved December 21, 1928.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry F. Sinclair
555 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to bring up the entire record and cause in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Atlee Pomerene and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the United States in support of the motion, and by Mr. George P. Hoover and Mr. Martin W. Littleton, for Sinclair, in opposition thereto.

Verde River Irrigation and Power Company, Petitioner,
174 vs.
Roy O. West, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause ninety days from this date, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sanitary Refrigerator Co., Petitioner,
128 vs.
Alexander F. Winters and Basil C. Crampton.
Alexander F. Winters and Basil C. Crampton, Petitioners,
547 vs.
Dent Hardware Company.

On consideration of the motion to pass case No. 128 and consolidate for argument with No. 547 as one case when the latter case is reached, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brictson Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, 584 vs. H. E. Close et al. Brictson Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, 585 vs. Mark J. Rosso. Brictson Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, 586 vs. H. E. Close, et al.	The motion for leave to dispense with printing and that petition for writs of certiorari be considered on typewritten petitions and record was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ben Jenkins for the petitioner.
The St. Louis & O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al., Appellants, 131 vs. The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, 132 vs. The St. Louis & O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. F. C. Dorety, leave was granted to file a brief of the Great Northern Ry. Co., as amicus curiae in these cases.
T. Tomich, Harry F. Scott, and H. Mulberger, Appellants, 14 vs. Union Trust Co., Spokane & Eastern Trust Co.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the thirteenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merwin F. wooten,
Appellant,
109 vs.
Brevard County, Florida.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. C. Crofton for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. W. E. Kay and Mr. Thomas B. Adams for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Arizona Superior Mining Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
173 vs.
John Carter Anderson.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis M. Hartman for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and by Mr. James P. Lavin for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Ry. Co.,
Petitioner,
133 vs.
Tobe Stapleton, by his statutory guardian, Marion Stapleton.

This case was submitted on printed briefs pursuant to the twenty-fifth rule by Mr. LeWright Browning for the petitioner, and by Mr. George B. Martin for the respondent.

Henry Young,
Appellant,
600 vs.
S. L. Staples, Edgar Smith, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Young pro se.

Eduarda K. Baltuff,
Petitioner,
609 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Eduarda K. Baltuff, pro se.

Percy W. Horton et al.,
Appellants,
504 vs.
William A. Prendergast, Commissioner of the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, et c., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen S. Hubbard for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Albert Ottinger, Mr. Albert J. Danaher, and Mr. Henry Purcell for the appellees in opposition thereto.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
83 vs.
Fleischmann, Morris & Co., Inc.
American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
84 vs.
Richmond Hardware Company.
American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
85 vs.
G. T. Elliott, Inc.
American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
86 vs.
L. M. Newcomb.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wyndham R. Meredith and Mr. Charles W. Stockton for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
526 vs.
The John Barth Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Quarles, Mr. Malcolm K. Whyte, Mr. Richard S. Doyle, and Mr. S. Sidney Stein for the respondents.

George Kearns, Pete Dahl, et al., Petitioners,
544 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Central Argentine Railway, Ltd., Petitioner,
546 vs.
Yone Suzuki et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Woolsey for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Sprague, Mr. Charles C. Burlingham, and Mr. Peter S. Carter for the respondents.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,
549 vs.
H. Mullendore, as Receiver of Wibaux County Bank, Wibaux, Montana.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sterling M. Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Loud and Mr. William B. Leavitt for the respondent.

James L. Boyle, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Frank H. Gordon,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
Herbert Gray et al.
James L. Boyle, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Frank H. Gordon,
Petitioner,
552 vs.
Artemus Weatherbee et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice E. Rosen and Mr. Joseph B. Jacobs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph F. Gould for the respondents.

O. E. Hotchkiss and Constance Lake,
Petitioners,
553 vs.
Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Alameda, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Eloise B. Cushing for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. M. Fitzgerald and Mr. Chas. A. Beardsley for the respondents.

C. F. Childs and Company,
Petitioner,
554 vs.
Harris Trust and Savings Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis L. Dent and Mr. Charles Y. Freeman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry Fitts for the respondent.

Goldye M. Dobson, Administratrix of the Estate of Rodney Hiram Dobson, deceased, Petitioner,
555 vs.
The United States of America, as Owner of the United States Submarine "S-51".
Tempa Russell Egbert, Administratrix of the Estate of Edmund Webster Egbert, deceased, Petitioner,
557 vs.
The United States of America, as Owner of the United States Submarine "S-51".
Lawrence B. Haselden, Executor of the Estate of James Dudley Haselden, Jr., deceased, Petitioner,
558 vs.
The United States of America, as Owner of the United States Submarine "S-51".

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Edward Becher, Petitioner,
559 vs.
Contoure Laboratories, Inc., and Herbert Oppenheimer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Moers for the respondent.

The United States of America and The People of Porto Rico, Petitioners,
560 vs.
Virgil Baker and Stella May Baker.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby, Mr. John A. Smith, and Mr. Edward A. Kreger for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank Davis, Jr., Mr. S. M. Stellwagen, Mr. Nelson Gamman, Mr. William D. Harris, and Mr. William J. Neale for the respondents.

Bermuda & West Indies Steamship Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
561 vs.
Oceanic Steam Navigation Company, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. McGrann for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent.

Standard Oil Company, Petitioner,
562 vs.
S. H. Cates, Sr., Administrator of S. H. Cates, Jr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Tillett and Mr. Charles W. Tillett, Jr., for the petitioner.

Raymond J. Delano,
Petitioner,
564 vs.
The City of Tulsa, H. F. Newblock, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. M. Langworthy, Mr. A. J. Biddison, Mr. Harry Campbell, and Mr. John H. Cantrell for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Rogers and Mr. Randolph Shirk for the respondents.

Martha C. Codman,
Petitioner,
566 vs.
Joshua W. Miles, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Maryland.
Martha C. Codman,
Petitioner,
567 vs.
Galen L. Tait, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Maryland.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John R. Lazenby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. S. Dee Hanson, Mr. C. M. Charest and Mr. Ottamar Hamele for the respondents.

Thomas M. Swift, Jr., alleged bankrupt, Petitioner,
569 vs.
A. B. Mobley, State Superintendent of Banks, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stephen C. Upson for the petitioner.

Curtis C. Kimball,
Petitioner,
570 vs.
Rathbone Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. S. Spillman for the petitioner.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company, Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, et al., Petitioners,
575 vs.
Central Union Trust Company of New York, Trustee, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel W. Sawyer, Mr. Edward J. White, Mr. N. H. Loomis, Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, and Mr. E. E. McInnis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt, Mr. Edward Cornell, Mr. Charles E. Hotchkiss, Mr. George H. Williams, Mr. Charles A. Houts, Mr. Charles P. Williams, Mr. Nicholas Kelley, Mr. H. C. McCollom, Mr. Edw. H. Blanc, Mr. W. W. Miller, and Mr. Perry D. Trafford for the respondents.

Hudson Trust Company and Fidelity Title & Mortgage Guaranty Company,
Petitioners,
580 vs.
Joseph M. Davis, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Frances S. Dyer, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Wickersham and Mr. Lionel P. Kristeller for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the respondent.

Mead-Morrison Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
581 vs.
Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen and Mr. Arthur P. French for the petitioner,

and by Mr. George W. Wickersham and Mr. Kenneth M. Goodwin for the respondent.

General Electric Company,
Petitioner,
582 vs.
The De Forest Radio Company and
Robelen Piano Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hubert Howson, Mr. Albert G. Davis, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight and Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the respondents.

Ex Parte: The Bakelite Corporation,
Petitioner,
17, Original.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause in this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the judges of the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 3, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon Lyon, It is ordered that A. F. Prescott, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Wilkins, It is ordered that Perley J. Rose and Joseph K. Moyer, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, It is ordered that Ray F. Drewry, Esquire, of Pierre, State of South Dakota, and William M. Potts, Esquire, of Mobridge, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elwood H. Seal, It is ordered that Max G. Dice, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that Edwin E. Tait, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Jenkins, It is ordered that Patrick J. Melillo, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones, It is ordered that Chas. C. Cook, Esquire, of Pampa, State of Texas , be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Harry F. Sinclair,

555 vs. O R D E R

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to bring up the entire record and cause in this case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is reassigned for argument on February 18th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Sampere,
Plaintiff in error and appellant,
321 vs.
The City of New Orleans.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Riley J. Wilson in behalf of Mr. William Winans Wall for the plaintiff in error and appellant, and Mr. B. I. Cahn and Mr. Henry B. Curtis for the defendant in error and appellee.

Ex Parte:
The Bakelite Corporation,
Petitioner,
17, Original.

The argument on the return to the rule to show cause in this case was continued by Mr. Myer Kraushaar for Frischer & Co., Inc., et al., and concluded by Mr. Samuel M. Richardson for the petitioner.

The St. Louis & O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al.,
Appellants,
131 vs.
The United States of America, and The Interstate Commerce Commission.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
132 vs.
The St. Louis & O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Daniel N. Kirby for the St. Louis and O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al; continued by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the St. Louis & O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al;, and by Mr. Donald Richberg for the National Conference on Valuation of American Railroads, as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 4, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is now opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Gibbons, It is ordered that Edward R. Brumley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod, It is ordered that Harry LeRoy Jones, Esquire, of Evanston, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Doyle, It is ordered that William H. Kelley, Jr., Esquire, of Richmond, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that H. C. Belt, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Peyre Gaillard, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Bradford, It is ordered that Loren Edmunds Souers, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore E. Burton, It is ordered that Joseph L. Witte, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The St. Louis & O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al., Appellants,
131 vs.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants,
132 vs.
The St. Louis & O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Donald R. Richberg for the National Conference on Valuation of American Railroads, as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court; by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the United States; by Mr. Walter L. Fisher for the Interstate Commerce Commission; and concluded by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the St. Louis and O'Fallon Ry. Co., et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard B. McCulloch, It is ordered that Charles Davis Frierson, Esquire, of Jonesboro, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lloyd B. Harrison, It is ordered that DeBose Boylston, Esquire, of Allendale, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Harry Covington, It is ordered that Stephen Warren Brethorst, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dill, It is ordered that Levi Boyd Donley, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Andrew D. Sharpe, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, It is ordered that Francis W. Peterson, Esquire, of La Grange, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dill, It is ordered that Patrick J. Moore, Esquire, of Pittsfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, It is ordered that Webster Atwell, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Brictson Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
584 vs.
H. E. Close, et al.
Brictson Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Mark J. Rosso, et al.
Brictson Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
586 vs.
H. E. Close, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to dispense with the printing of the petition, brief and record in these causes, and that the petition for writs of certiorari be considered on a typewritten petition, briefs and records, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arizona Superior Mining Company,

Plaintiff in error,

173 vs.

John Carter Anderson.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the defendant in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Sampere,

Plaintiff in error and appellant,

321 vs.

City of New Orleans.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Young,

Appellant,

600 vs.

S. L. Staples, Edgar Smith, T. J. Butler, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1296.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Young,
Appellant,
vs.
S. L. Staples, Edgar Smith, T. J. Butler, et al.

600

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eduarda K. Baltuff,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

609

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eduarda K. Baltuff,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

609

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Percy W. Horton, Chace F. Horton and Fannie L. Horton,

Appellants,

504 vs.

William A. Prendergast, Commissioner of the Public Service Commission of the State of New York and Chairman thereof, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

526 vs.

The John Barth Company and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward Becher,

Petitioner,

559 vs.

Contoure Laboratories, Inc., and Herbert Oppenheimer.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, vs. Fleischmann, Morriss & Co., Inc. 83

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, vs. Richmond Hardware Company. 84

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company, Petitioner, vs. G. T. Elliott, Inc. 85

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Railway Express Company,
Petitioner,
86 vs.
L. M. Newcomb.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Kearns, Pete Dahl,
Ed Graham, et al.,
Petitioners,
544 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central Argentine Railway, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
546 vs.
Yone Suzuki, et al., Gano Moore Company and Gano Moore Coal Mining Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,
549 vs.
H. Mullendore, as Receiver of Wibaux County Bank, Wibaux Montana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James L. Boyle, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Frank H. Gordon, Petitioner,
551 vs.
Herbert Gray, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James L. Boyle, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Frank H. Gordon, Petitioner,
552 vs.
Artemus Weatherbee, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. E. Hotchkiss and Constance Lake, Petitioners,
553 vs.
Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Alameda, and the Honorable T. W. Harris, Judge.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. F. Childs and Company, Petitioner,
554 vs.
Harris Trust and Savings Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Goldye M. Dobson, Administratrix of the Estate of Rodney Hiram Dobson deceased, Petitioner,
556 vs.
The United States of America, as Owner of the United States Submarine-"S-51".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that

Tempa Russell Egbert, Administratrix of the Estate of Edmund Webster Egbert, deceased, Petitioner,
557 vs.
The United States of America, as Owner of the United States Submarine "S-51".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lawrence B. Haselden, Executor of the Estate of James Dudley Haselden, Jr., deceased, Petitioner,
558 vs.
The United States of America, as Owner of the United States Submarine "S-51".

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bermuda & West Indies Steamship Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
561 vs.
Oceanic Steam Navigation Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Oil Company, Petitioner,
562 vs.
S. H. Cates, Sr., Administrator of S. H. Cates, Jr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raymond J. DeLano, Petitioner,
564 vs.
The City of Tulsa, H. F. Newblock, Mayor, J. C. Whiteside, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Martha C. Codman,

Petitioner,

566 vs.

Joshua W. Miles, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Martha C. Codman,

Petitioner,

567 vs.

Galen L. Tait, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas M. Swift, Jr., Alleged Bankrupt, Petitioner,

569 vs.

A. B. Mobley, State Superintendent of Banks, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Curtis C. Kimball,

Petitioner,

570 vs.

Rathbone Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kansas City Terminal Railway Company, Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Charles G. Hutcheson, et al.,

Petitioners,

575 vs.

Central Union Trust Company of New York, Trustee, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hudson Trust Company and Fidelity Title & Mortgage Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
580 vs.
Joseph M. Davis, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Frances S. Dyer, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mead-Morrison Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
581 vs.
Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Bear Tractors, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Electric Company, Petitioner,
582 vs.
The DeForest Radio Company and Robelen Piano Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Y. Fauntleroy, Former Collector of Internal Revenue for the Collection District of Louisiana, Petitioner, vs. Elmer Candy Company, Inc. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

119

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respondent has filed a confession of error in this cause, and Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, in behalf of counsel for the respondent, having moved the Court to reverse the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals and affirm the judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said confession of error and motion thereon, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the judgment of the said District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Harry Whyel and George Whyel. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

525

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Daniel B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-Third District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner,

527 vs.

Henry Wilhelm Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ohio Oil Company, Appellant,

514 vs.

E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. H. Cake in behalf of Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellant and by Mr. Percy Saint for the appellee.

Firemens' Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, Appellant,

376 vs.

James A. Beha, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. John W. Davis suggesting the expiration of office of James A. Beha, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York, and he having moved the Court to substitute Albert Conway, successor in office of James A. Beha, as the party appellee in this cause,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Erling Brauti and Opal E. Brauti,
copartners doing business under
the firm name and style of Wheeler
Pharmacy, Plaintiff in error, In error to the District Court of
534 vs. the United States for the District
Westwood Lumber Company. of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the plaintiff in error has failed to file the statement as to jurisdiction as required by the Rules of this Court;

Therefore, in pursuance of the Twelfth Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward L. Howell and Marie E.
Howell, Plaintiff in error, In error to the District Court
535 vs. of the United States for the
Westwood Lumber Company. District of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the plaintiffs in error has failed to file the statement as to jurisdiction as required by the Rules of this Court;

Therefore, in pursuance of the Twelfth Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard A. Owen and Bert S. Kingsley, copartners doing business under the firm name and style of O. K. Trading Company,

Plaintiffs in error,

536 vs.

Westwood Lumber Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the plaintiffs in error has failed to file the statement as to jurisdiction as required by the Rules of this Court;

Therefore, in pursuance of the Twelfth Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kenneth Bannister, a sole trader doing business under the firm name and style of Wheeler Furniture-Hardware Company,

Plaintiff in error,

537 vs.

Westwood Lumber Company.

In error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the plaintiff in error has failed to file the statement as to jurisdiction as required by the Rules of this Court;

Therefore, in pursuance of the Twelfth Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Geo. B. Williams, William J. Finn, M. L. Myers, et al., Appellants,
529 vs.
Ray L. Riley, as State Controller of the State of the State of California.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Ewing and Mr. W. R. Crawford for the appellants.

Bekins Van Line, Inc., Chew Chick, et al., Appellants,
530 vs.
Ray L. Riley, as State Controller of the State of California.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Sea., Jr., for the appellants.

Potomac Electric Power Company, Petitioner,
573 vs.
Cuno H. Rudolph et al.
Washington Railway & Electric Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
Cuno H. Rudolph et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Bowen and Mr. John S. Barbour for the petitioners, and by Mr. William W. Bride and Mr. F. H. Stephens for the respondents.

Galliher & Huguely, Inc., and Jarrett G. Huddleston, trading as M. C. Huddleston & Co., Petitioners,
577 vs.
George T. Harper, E. G. Schafer & Co., Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitte to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Winthip Wheatley and Mr. James A. O'Shea for the petitioners, and by Mr. L. A. Bailey for the respondents.

O. E. Sutter, H. H. Birkett, et al., Petitioners,
595 vs.
Midland Valley Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry William Hart for the petitioners, and by Mr. O. E. Swan for the respondent.

Firemen's Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, Appellant,
376 vs.
Albert Conway, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York.

This case was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellant, and by Mr. Henry S. Manley for the appellee.

The Cudahy Packing Company, a corporation, Appellant,
278 vs.
Jay Grant Hinkle, Secretary of State, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. J. Harry Covington and Mr. S. W. Brethorst for the appellant, and by Mr. Levi B. Donley for the appellees.

United States of America as Owner of the Steam Collier "Proteus", Petitioner,
21 vs.
Commonwealth and Dominion Line., Ltd., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum for the petitioner, and by Mr. Allan B. A. Bradley for the respondent.

White River Lumber Co., Plaintiff in error,
101 vs.
State of Arkansas ex rel. H. W. Applegate, Attorney General.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas S. Buzbee for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. John M. Rose for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, It is ordered that Carl J. Stephens, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Offutt, It is ordered that Preston M. Albro, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

White River Lumber Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
101 vs.
The State of Arkansas ex rel., H. W. Applegate, Attorney General.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John M. Rose for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. George Vaughn for the defendant in error.

Captain John Larson,
Appellant,
102 vs.
The State of South Dakota.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Wm. M. Potts for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Empire Gas & Fuel Co., et al.,
Petitioners,
103 vs.
J. M. Saunders et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles C. Cook for the respondents, and submitted by Mr. David B. Trammell, Mr. J. W. Finley, and Mr. Warren T. Spies for the petitioners.

Eastern & Western Lumber Co., et al., Plaintiffs in error,
105 vs.
Isaac L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon et al.
Eastern & Western Lumber Co., et al., Appellants,
194 vs.
Isaac L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. James G. Wilson for the plaintiffs in error and appellants, and by Mr. Willis S. Moore for the defendants in error and appellees.

Eastern and Western Lumber Company, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
105 vs.
Isaac L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon; et al.
Eastern and Western Lumber Company, et al., Appellants,
194 vs.
Isaac L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon; Sam A. Kozer, Secretary of State, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Willis S. Moore suggesting the expiration of office of Sam A. Kozer, as Secretary of State of the State of Oregon, and he having moved the Court to substitute Hal E. Hoss, successor in office of Sam A. Kozer, as a party defendant in error and appellee in these causes, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Thomas Allen, Esquire, of Brookline, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, It is ordered that Robert Mayer, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Watson, It is ordered that Edward W. Fearing, Esquire, of Baldwin, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Great Northern Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
106 vs.
The State of Minnesota.
Great Northern Railway Co.,
Appellant
107 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

These cases were argued by Mr. F. C. Dorety for the plaintiff in error and appellant, and by Mr. C. A. Youngquist for the defendant in error, and appellee.

State Trust & Savings Bank,
Petitioner,
108 vs.
C. A. Dunn, Trustee of the Investment Bond & Mortgage Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Webster Atwell for the petitioner. No brief filed for the respondent.

Exchange Trust Co., executor of the Estate of Roy Rice, deceased,
Plaintiff in error, and appellant,
114 vs.
Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Arthur L. Adams and Mr. J. A. Tellier for the plaintiff in error, and appellant and by Mr. R. B. McCulloch for the defendant in error, and appellee St. Francis levee district. Counsel to prepare and submit a proposed form of judgment on or before January 18, next.

Jens C. Nielson, administrator,
Petitioner,
115 vs.
R. E. Johnson, Treasurer of State.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Nelson Miller for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that Thos. J. Horsley, Esquire, of Wewoka, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that Claibourne G. Perry, Esquire, of Bridgeport, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Hamilton, It is ordered that Charles Radley Webber, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Exchange Trust Company, Executor of
the estate of Roy Rice, deceased,

Plaintiff in error,
and appellant,

114 vs.

Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett
County, Arkansas, and its Commissioners,
et al.

In error to and appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard at this term, and was argued by counsel; and thereupon, upon consideration thereof, counsel for defendant in error, St. Francis Levee District, consenting, it was ordered, adjudged, and decreed as follows: viz:

That the prayer of the complaint for cancellation of decrees of foreclosure in favor of defendant in error, St. Francis Levee District, is granted, and said decrees are cancelled and held for naught as clouds upon the title to said lands; and said St. Francis Levee District is forever enjoined from taxing or attempting to tax said lands to pay for improvements made or administrative or other expenses incurred prior to issuing of final certificate by the United States; that said lands are subject to tax for the cost of improvements, administrative, or other expenses of said St. Francis Levee District contracted for subsequent to the issuing of final certificate from the United States and the Supreme Court of Arkansas is reversed in so far as the judgment is inconsistent herewith, and the cause is remanded to the Supreme Court of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with this conclusion.

Mandate will issue accordingly.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jens C. Nielson, Administrator,

Petitioner,

115 vs.

R. E. Johnson, Treasurer of State.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Nelson Miller for the petitioner, by Mr. John Fletcher for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Nelson Miller for the petitioner.

Isom Grayson, Micey Keys, Paulina Carolina, et al., Petitioners, 116 vs. James A. Harris, William H. Harris, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the petitioners and by Mr. Robert P. Blair for the respondents.
Daniel Michael McDonald, Petitioner, 117 vs. The United States of America.	This case was argued by Mr. J. Harry Covington and Mr. Dean G. Acheson for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Butte for the respondent.
Michigan Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, 118 vs. George E. Mix and A. B. Frey, Judges, etc., et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Arthur Stahl and Mr. E. D. Andrews for the respondents.
The United States of America, 129 vs. Boston and Maine Railroad. Old Colony Trust Company, et al., executors, 130 vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the United States in No. 129 and for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in No. 130.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Joseph D. Brady, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Cyril M. Joly, Esquire, of Waterville, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that William C. Crossley and Frederick Kavolsky, Esquires, of Fall River, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
129 vs.
Boston and Maine Railroad.
Old Colony Trust Company et al., executors,
130 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the United States in No. 129 and for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in No. 130; by Mr. James S.Y. Ivins for the Boston and Maine Railroad in No. 129; and concluded by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine for the Old Colony Trust et al., in No. 130. Leave granted counsel to file briefs within two weeks.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Plaintiff in error,
135 vs.
R. D. White, as Administrator of W. B. White, et al.
The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Appellant,
169 vs.
R. D. White, as Administrator of W. B. White, et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the plaintiff in error and appellant, and by Mr. Walter P. Armstrong for the defendants in error and appellees.

Rice and Adams Corporation, Petitioner,
155 vs.
Harry D. Lathrop.

This case was argued by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts for the respondent, and submitted by Mr. Charles J. Staples and Mr. William P. Conley for the petitioner.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
160 vs.
J. E. Kirk.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. T. Hall for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 14 next.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland, Associate Justices.

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Harold H. Clarke, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that Thomas A. Martin, Esquire, of Hot Springs, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. L. Herold, It is ordered that Richard Leroy Benoit, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank W. Grahmey, It is ordered that William Waller, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Samuel Prela, trading as Selwell Blouse Company, Petitioner, vs. Louis Hubshman, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Samuel Prela, Trading as Selwell Blouse Company.

91

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Oriel and Joseph Confino, individually and as Members of the firm of Oriel, Confino & Co., Petitioners, vs. William E. Russell, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Oriel, Confino & Co.

92

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Wisconsin, State of Minnesota,
State of Ohio, and State of Pennsylvania,

Complainants,

7, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District
of Chicago;

Defendants,

O R D E R

State of Missouri, State of Kentucky,
State of Tennessee, State of Louisiana,
State of Mississippi, and State of
Arkansas, Intervening Defendants

It is now here ordered that this cause be again referred to Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Special Master, for further examination into the questions indicated by the opinion of this Court this day announced. He is authorized and directed to hear witnesses presented by each of the parties, and to call witnesses of his own selection, should he deem it necessary to do so, and then with all convenient speed shall make report of his conclusions and of a form of decree.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Michigan,

Complainant,

11, Original. vs.

O R D E R

State of Illinois and Sanitary District
of Chicago.

It is now here ordered that this cause be again referred to Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Special Master, for further examination into the questions indicated by the opinion of this Court this day announced. He is authorized and directed to hear witnesses presented by each of the parties, and to call witnesses of his own selection, should he deem it necessary to do so, and then with all convenient speed shall make report of his conclusions and of a form of decree.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of New York,

Complainant,

12 Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

ORDER

It is now here ordered that this cause be again referred to Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Special Master, for further examination into the questions indicated by the opinion of this Court this day announced. He is authorized and directed to hear witnesses presented by each of the parties, and to call witnesses of his own selection, should he deem it necessary to do so, and then with all convenient speed shall make report of his conclusions and of a form of decree.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Ohio Oil Company,

Appellant,

514 vs.

E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this case, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, February 25th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Geo. B. Williams, William J. Finn, et al., Appellants,

529 vs.

Ray L. Riley, as State Controller, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bekins Van Line Inc., et al., Appellants,
530 vs.
Ray L. Riley, as State Controller, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
133 vs.
Tobe Stapleton, by his statutory guardian, Marion Stapleton.

It is ordered that this case be restored to the docket. New briefs are directed to be filed, and the case set down for appropriate oral argument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Firemen's Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, Appellant,
376 vs.
Albert Conway, as Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Empire Gas & Fuel Company and Equitable Trust Company, Petitioners, vs. J. M. Saunders, et al. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

103

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eastern and Western Lumber Company, Oregon-American Lumber Company, and Silver Falls Timber Company, Plaintiffs in error, vs. Isaac L. Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon; Hal E. Hoss, Secretary of State of the State of Oregon, and Thos. B. Kay, State Treasurer of the State of Oregon. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

105

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eastern and Western Lumber Company,
Oregon-American Lumber Company, and
Silver Falls Timber Company,
Appellants,
194 vs.
Isaac L. Patterson, Governor of the
State of Oregon; Hal E. Hoss,
Secretary of State, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Merwin F. Wooten,
Appellant,
109 vs.
Brevard County, Florida.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State Trust & Savings Bank,

Petitioner,

108 vs.

C. A. Dunn, Trustee of the Investment Bond & Mortgage Company, a Bankrupt.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. E. Sutter, H. H. Birkett, The Derby Oil Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

595 vs.

Midland Valley Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and
The People of Porto Rico,
Petitioners,
560 vs.
Virgil Baker and Stella May Baker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Potomac Electric Power Company,
Petitioner,
573 vs.
Cuno H. Rudolph, J. Franklin Bell and Frederick A. Fenning, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Washington Railway & Electric Company, Petitioner,
574 vs.
Guno H. Rudolph, J. Franklin Bell and Frederick A. Fenning, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galliher & Huguely, Inc., and Jarrett G. Huddleston, trading as M. C. Huddleston & Co., Petitioners,
577 vs.
George T. Harper, E. G. Schafer & Co., Inc., J. H. Harwood, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

The Court will take a recess from Monday, January 21st next to Monday, February 18th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Winthrop Loveland, as Executor of the Estate of Florence Lee Loveland, deceased; Helen Loveland Armstrong, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

151

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, of counsel for the respondent in this cause, and he having confessed error and having moved the Court to reverse the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals and affirm the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said confession of error, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the judgment of the said District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Oscar Edvin Ferdinand Perrson; The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Marco Nicolich.

195

196

On consideration of the motion to pass these cases to await the decision in case No. 117, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: The Bakelite Corporation, Petitioner,
17, Original.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Albert MacC. Barnes, for the petitioner, leave was granted to file a brief for the petitioner on or before January 18th next.

E. W. Porter, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Idaho, etc., Petitioner,
617 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to dispense with printing, with leave to respondent to file a memorandum in opposition within two days, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leslie J. Aker for the petitioner.

Arlington Hotel Company, Plaintiff in error,
157 vs.
Elizabeth H. Pant et al.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. William Waller, leave was granted to file a brief of Mrs. Elise Williams, as amicus curiae, in this case.

The Okanogan, Methow Indian Tribes, et al., Petitioners,
565 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Lewis, Mr. A. R. Serven, and Mr. John G. Carter for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

Pauchoque Land Corporation, Petitioner,
583 vs.
Long Island State Park Commissioner, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach, Mr. Martin A. Schenck, and Mr. Wm. J. Hughes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the respondent.

W. H. & J. P. Peacock,
Petitioners,
588 vs.
C. T. Wofford.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Norman I. Miller for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. C. B. Sparks for the respondent.

Abram Minis, Executor, et al.,
Petitioners,
589 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Clay for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Frank K. Dyar for the respondent.

Jacob A. Overlander,
Petitioner,
592 vs.
Jesse L. Overlander and John S. Bishop.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas and/or the District Court of Doniphan County, State of Kansas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob A. Overlander, pro se.

John Di Bella,
Petitioner,
593 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Cecil Lundquist,
Petitioner,
594 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Miner for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. J. C. Gamble, and Mr. Alden B. Howland for the respondent.

C. J. Haskell,
Petitioner,
596 vs.
Gypsy Oil Company.

The petition for a writ ofcertiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. L. Stuart, Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, and Mr. R. R. Bell for the petitioner.

The Continental Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
Annie Scott Willis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Hurt, Jr., for the petitioner.

Anna H. Smith,
Petitioner,
613 vs.
John V. Reishman, Charleston Trust Company, and Bessie Walker.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Kanawha County, State of West Virginia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude L. Smith for the petitioner.

Magnolia Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error and appellant,
148 vs.
Graves Leeper, as Secretary of State of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant to pass this cause until Monday, March 11, next, and pursuant to stipulation of counsel, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
J. E. Kirk.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Homer T. Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. John R. Pendleton for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Homer T. Hall for the petitioner.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon G. Godley, and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
159 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Co. and Manhattan Ry. Co.,

The re-argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Irwin Untermyer for the appellant, the Transit Commission of New York, and continued by Mr. Charles L. Craig for the appellant, The City of New York.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard C. Kilpatrick, It is ordered that Raymond Harper, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, It is ordered that Edward L. Potter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur S. Browne, It is ordered that George L. Chindahl, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Craig, It is ordered that Leon G. Godley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thos M. Woodward, It is ordered that Walter J. Larrabee, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman B. Landreau, It is ordered that Raphael M. O'Hara, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Roger B. Siddall, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel H. Crowl, It is ordered that Nellie M. Crowl, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Blair, It is ordered that Clair R. Millyer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that Thomas W. Harrison, Esquire, of Winchester, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Finis J. Garrett, Esquire, of Dresden, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ella Rawls Reader Stokely et al., Appellants,
205 vs.
The State of Mississippi, Rush H. Knox, Attorney General, et al.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. Garner W. Green, and Mr. Chalmers Potter for the appellants, with leave to counsel for appellees to file a brief within two weeks, on motion of Mr. Ross A. Collins on behalf of Mr. Rush H. Knox, for the appellees.

Hart Refineries, Appellant,
210 vs.
W. E. Harmon, as Treasurer of the State of Montana.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Patterson for the appellant. No brief filed for the appellee.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon C. Godley, and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al., Appellants,
159 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Co. and Manhattan Ry. Co.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles L. Craig for the appellant, the City of New York, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. E. Denison, It is ordered that Charles S. Miller, Esquire, of Mound City, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, It is ordered that John Carlisle Swaim, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Clague, It is ordered that Oluf Gjerset, Esquire, of Montevideo, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dallas S. Townsend, It is ordered that Gardner Dugald Howie, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., It is ordered that Perry J. Stearns, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, It is ordered that William F. Delaney, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

By direction of the Chief Justice the following correspondence is spread upon the minutes:

"Al Honorable Senor Presidente del Tribunal Supremo Federal de los Estados Unidos de America del Norte.

(SEAL)

Honorable Senor:

Ha sido muy grato para esta Presidencia, recibir la visita de Don Logan M. Rock, Comandante del Ejercito americano y Attorney at Law and Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, y aprovechando la oportunidad de su viaje de retorno a esa Republica, teno el honor de enviar por su conducto, a V.E. y a los Honorables Magistrados que con V. E. comparten la mas alta representacion de la Justicia en esa Republica, la cordial expresion del saludo y de los sentimientos de companerismo y solidaridad profesional, de cuantos tenemos la honra de constituir este Tribunal Supremo,, de Justicia de Espana.

Muy atentamente suyo,

El Presidente del Tribunal Supremo de Espana,

(signed) Rafael Bermejo

(transalation)

"To the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America:

Sir:

It has been a genuine pleasure for us to receive the visit of Mr. Logan N. Rock, Major of the American Army and Attorney at Law and Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, and taking advantage of his return voyage to the United States, I am proud to convey, through him, to you and to the Honorable Magistrates who with you compose the highest representation of Justice in that Republic, the most cordial greetings and expressions of fellowship and professional solidarity, of all members of the Supreme Court of Spain.

Respectfully,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Spain
(Signed) Rafael Bermejo
Palacio de Justicia, Madrid, January 1927. "

"Supreme Court of the United States

Washington, D.C.

December 22, 1928.

"Your Excellency:

The members of the Supreme Court of the United States have been much gratified by the receipt of a message from your great and distinguished tribunal, conveyed through Major Logan N. Rock, formerly of the American Army, and now a counsellor at law and member of our Supreme Court, of the most cordial greetings and kindly expressions of fellowship and professional sympathy of all the members of the Supreme Court of Spain.

On behalf of our Court, I beg to thank your Excellency for this warm expression of good will and this strengthening of the bond of the two Courts of the two great Nations whom we honor and love. It would gratify us very much if we could welcome with expressions of our good will the members of the great tribunal of your country. Our Court in its life of nearly one hundred and fifty years has had the opportunity and the duty to consider with highest respect the principles of jurisprudence announced by your Court in respect to matters of our common concern.

Permit me to express our high appreciation of your friendly greeting, and accept the assurances of our most distinguished consideration.

Sincerely yours,

His Excellency, (Signed) Wm. H. Taft.
Senor Don Rafael Bermejo,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Spain,

Raul Rogerio Gonzalez, by his guardian ad litem, Adelaida Gonzalez, Petitioner,
226 vs.
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, suggesting the death of Adelaida Gonzalez, guardian ad litem of Raul Rogerio Gonzalez; and he having moved the Court to substitute Leon Gonzalez, guardian ad litem of Raul Rogerio Gonzalez, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raul Rogerio Gonzalez, by his guardian ad litem, Leon Gonzalez, Petitioner,
226 vs.
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila.

On consideration of the motion to pass this case until April 8th next, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon G. Godley, and Charles C. Lockwood, constituting the Transit Commission, etc., et al., Appellants,
159 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Co. and Manhattan Ry. Co.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the appellees; by Mr. Charles L. Craig for the appellant, The City of New York; and concluded by Mr. Irwin Untermyer for the appellant, The Transit Commission of New York.

Charles L. Douglas, Petitioner,
312 vs.
The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles D. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. R. Brumley for the respondent.

Graysburg Oil Co.,

Plaintiff in error,

147 vs.

The State of Texas.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Victor Keller for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKeller, It is ordered that R. G. Brown, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude A. Swanson, It is ordered that Eugene Charles Hurt, Jr., of Chatham, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore E. Burton, It is ordered that Meta W. Peters, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Schwertner, It is ordered that Gertrude C. Eisenberg, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred H. Dominick, It is ordered that Louis M. Shimel, Esquire, of Charleston, State South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth D. McKellar, It is ordered that Samuel O. Bates, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Graysburg Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error,
147 vs.
The State of Texas.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Victor Keller for the plaintiff in error; by Mr. D. A. Simmons for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. Victor Keller for the plaintiff in error.

Arlington Hotel Company,
Plaintiff in error,
157 vs.
Elizabeth H. Fant, Mary L. Fortune, and R. T. Fant.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas K. Martin for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. William Waller for the defendant in error.

Ralph L. Hunt,
Plaintiff in error,
161 vs.
Milton W. Hunt.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wayne C. Williams for the plaintiff in error. No brief filed for the defendant in error.

Henry Leonard,
Petitioner,
183 vs
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. George A. King for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

J. Earl Morgan,
Appellant and Plaintiff in error,
208 vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Perry J. Stearns for the appellant and plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument. Leave was granted appellant and plaintiff in error to file petition for certiorari on or before February 18 next.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
219 vs.
John Koske.

This case was argued by Mr. Walter J. Larrabee for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Faerber Goldenhorn for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis,

George Sutherland, Associate Justices.

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Reid It is ordered that Benj. H. Black, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abraham E. Hursman, It is ordered that Joseph Blank and Abram Orlow, Esquires, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co., Petitioner,

225 vs.

Marcella Driggers, as Administratrix, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis M. Shimel for the respondent.

Jorgensen-Bennett Mfg. Co., Appellant,
230 vs.
Will S. Knight, Sheriff, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. R. G. Brown for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Jorgensen-Bennett Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
230 vs.
Will S. Knight, Sheriff, and W. S. Hall, Commissioner Excise Tax Division.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the trancript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western & Atlantic R. R. Petitioner,
234 vs.
Mrs. Nora E. Hughes, Administratrix, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Reuben R. Arnold for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barry Mohun , It is ordered that Grier Bartol, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mark Stearman It is ordered that Samuel S. Burman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude A. Swanson, It is ordered that B. A. Banks, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Frank R. Coder, Esquire, of Somerset, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur H. Greenwood, It is ordered that Ralph R. Roberts, Esquire, of Rockport, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that John T. Suggs, Esquire, of Denison, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, as owner of the Steam Collier "Proteus," Petitioner, vs. Commonwealth and Dominion Line (Ltd.), as Owner of the Steamship "Port Philip." — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Exchange Trust Company, Executor
of the Estate of Roy Rice, deceased,
Plaintiff in error and appellant,
114 vs.
Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett
County, Arkansas, and its Commissioners
and the St. Francis Levee District and
its Board of Directors.

In error to and appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs as to the Drainage District.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Western & Atlantic Railroad
Appellant,
519 vs.
Mrs. Mary E. Henderson and Maryland
Casualty Company.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is restored to the docket as one in which the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. W. Porter, Commissioner of
Finance of the State of Idaho,
Liquidating Agent of the Citizens
State Bank of Buhl, Idaho,
Petitioner,
617 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to dispense with the printing of parts of the record in this cause, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
J. E. Kirk.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Graysburg Oil Company,
Plaintiff in error,
147 vs.
The State of Texas.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ralph L. Hunt,
Plaintiff in error,
161 vs.
Milton W. Hunt.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Earl Morgan,

Appellant and Plaintiff in error,

208 vs.

Wisconsin Tax Commission.

Appeal from and in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heardon the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal and writ of error in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jorgensen-Bennett Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,

230 vs.

Will S. Knight, Sheriff, and W. S. Hall, Commissioner of Excise Tax Division.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,

225 vs.

Marcella Driggers, as Administratrix of William A. Driggers, deceased.

It is ordered that this case be restored to the docket for a reargument and assigned for Monday, April 8 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hart Refineries,

Appellant,

490 vs.

The State of Montana.

It is ordered that the mandate heretofore issued in this cause be, recalled, to await the decision of this Court in the case of Hart Refineries vs. Harmon, Treasurer., No. 210.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Okanogan, Methow, San Poelis (or San Poil) Nespelem, Colville and Lake Indian Tribes or Bands of the State of Washington,

Petitioners,

565 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pauchoque Land Corporation,

Petitioner,

583 vs.

Long Island State Park Commissioner, Robert Moses, Townsend Scudder, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. H. & J. P. Peacock,

Petitioners,

588 vs.

G. T. Wofford.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abram Minis, Executor and Maria Minis, Executrix, under will of Lavinia F. Minis,

Petitioners,

589 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob A. Overlander,

Petitioner,

592 vs.

Jesse L. Overlander and John J. Bishop.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and/or District Court, Doniphan County, State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and/or District Court, Doniphan County, State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Di Bella
Petitioner,
593 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cecil Lundquist,
Petitioner,
594 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. J. Haskell,
Petitioner,
596 vs.
Gypsy Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Continental Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
Annie Scott Willis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna H. Smith,
Petitioner,
613 vs.
John V. Reishman, Charleston Trust Company and Bessie Walker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Kanawha County of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Kanawha County of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: In the matter of O. Tomson et al.,
Petitioners.
___ Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Laskey for the petitioner.

The People of the State of New York, Appellants,
601 vs.
Gamble Latrobe, Jr., et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hamilton Ward and Mr. Robert P. Beyer for the appellants, and suggestion of appellees thereto submitted by Mr. Frederick F. Greenman for the appellees.

John G. Sullivan, ex rel. Jee Gim Bew, Petitioner,
599 vs.
Anna C. M. Tillinghast, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lehrbas, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

William Buck Self, Petitioner,
602 vs.
Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Rogers and Mr. L. O. Lytle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Preston C. West, Mr. T. J. Flannely, Mr. Nathan A. Gibson, Mr. Joseph L. Hull, and Mr. A. A. Davidson for the respondent.

J. Henry Neal, William F. Kennedy, et al., Petitioners,
605 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Harold Hitchcock for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Lyndan H. Baylies for the respondent.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
607 vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
608 vs.
Barber Asphalt Paving Company.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry N. Paul, Mr. John W. Davis, and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner in No. 607 and respondent in No. 608, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight, Mr. Alexander F. Reichmann, Mr. Frank L. Belknap, and Mr. William F. Hall for the petitioner in No. 608 and respondent in No. 607.

Andrew M. Parks, as Trustee,
et al., Petitioners,
630 vs.
Charles F. Knapp, as Receiver
etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. Fosnes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Oluf Gjerset for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 18 next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Delano Putnam, It is ordered that R. Ammi Cutter, Esquire, of Cambridge, State of Massachusetts, and W. Trowbridge Forbes, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clair R. Millyer, It is ordered that Philip H. Porter, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Challen B. Ellis, It is ordered that Robert S. Sloan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard A. Ford, It is ordered that Oscar K. Mauldin, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that John A. Sheean, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Hoover, It is ordered that Hubert G. King, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Emanuel Celler, It is ordered that Samuel C. Dubernstein, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that C. Wright Manley, Esquire, of Plandome, State of New York, and Charles S. Baker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Angel Suntay, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Philip Hill, It is ordered that Leroy W. Hunt, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio; John Thomas Cano, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas; and Charles Ruzicka, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Taylor, It is ordered that Albert Sheridan Frost, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Maude Hamilton Yates, of Warrenton, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira L. Ewers, It is ordered that Morris Cukor, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor on this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira L. Ewers, It is ordered that Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry Leonard,

Petitioner,

183 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Jens C. Nielsen, Administrator,

Petitioner,

115 vs.

R. E. Johnson, Treasurer of State.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Morimura, Arai & Co.,

Petitioners,

18 vs.

Nathan Taback and Louis Taback, Individually and as Copartners, Trading as Taback Brothers.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey with instructions to enter a decree sustaining the specification of opposition relating to the written statement and denying the bankrupts' application for discharge.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Morgan L. Davis, as Administrator of the Estate of W. Baylor Richards, Deceased. 70

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

W. D. Manley, Appellant, vs. The State of Georgia. 429

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. John Koske. 219

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Daniel Michael McDonald, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 117

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause, be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Hart Refineries,

Appellant,

210 vs.

W. E. Harmon, as Treasurer of the State of Montana.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Hart Refineries,

Appellant,

490 vs.

The State of Montana.

O R D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment heretofore entered on December 10, 1928, in the above entitled cause, be, and the same is hereby, vacated.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hart Refineries,

Appellant,

490 vs.

The State of Montana.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Plaintiff in error,

106 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Appellant,

107 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Rice & Adams, Corporation,

Petitioner,

155 vs.

Harry D. Lathrop.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

W. A. Frost, Doing business under the Name of Mitchell Gin Company,

Appellant,

60 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, Ered Capshaw, Frank Carter, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Leo Salomon, Jacques H. Hecht, Isidore M. Kastner, et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error,

79 vs.

State of Tax Commission of New York.

In error to the Surrogates' Court of New York County, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Surrogates' Court of New York County, State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Surrogates' Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Nettie I. Simonson, Ettie B. Simonson, and Farmers Loan & Trust Company, etc., Plaintiffs in error, vs. State Tax Commission of New York. — In error to the Surrogates' Court of New York Couty, State of New York.

80

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Surrogates Court of New York County, State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Surrogates Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Michigan Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. George E. Mix and A. B. Frey, Judges, etc., et al. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

118

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; ~~and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs;~~ and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Western & Atlantic Railroad

Petitioner,

234 vs.

Mrs. Nora E. Hughes, as Administratrix of the Estate of Ira L. Hughes, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Cudahy Packing Company, a Corporation, Appellant,

278 vs.

Jay Grant Hinkle, Secretary of State, and John H. Dunbar, Attorney General of the State of Washington.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Elizabeth C. Taft,

Petitioner,

16 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Gilbert C. Greenway, Jr.,

Petitioner,

17 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause, be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Chief Justice Taft took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Plaintiff in error, vs. R. D. White, as Administrator of W. B. White; Elizabeth White, by her next Friend, R. D. White; Lizzie J. White, et al. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee. — 135

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Appellant, vs. R. D. White, as Administrator of W. B. White; Elizabeth White, by her next Friend, R. D. White; Lizzie J. White, et al. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee. — 169

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Tennessee.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Captain John Larson,

Appellant,

102 vs.

The State of South Dakota.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arlington Hotel Company,

Plaintiff in error,

157 vs.

Elizabeth H. Fant, Mary L. Fortune, and R. T. Fant.

In error to the Supreme Court of the Stateof Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The People of the State of New York, Appellants,

601 vs.

Gamble Latrobe, Jr., James P. Knowles, and William S. Erichs, Trustees, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 8th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of
O. Tomson, et al., Petitioners,
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
129 vs.
Boston and Maine Railroad.
Old Colony Trust Company, et al.,
Executors,
130 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

It is ordered that the above cause be restored to the docket for reargument. The Court especially desires assistance of counsel in respect of the following matters:

1. Was there power in Congress to confer jurisdiction upon the Circuit Court of Appeals to review action by the Board of Tax Appeals?

2. Does the Circuit Court of Appeals act as a tribunal of original jurisdiction when considering appeals from the Board of Tax Appeals? If so, may it under Title 28, United States Code, sec. 346, certify to this Court questions deemed necessary for the proper decision of a pending cause?

3. What has been the practice of taxing officers relative to assessments where, by agreement between the parties, the tax laid upon the income actually received by one of them has been paid by another?

4. Do applicable statutes authorize the taxing officers to estimate total income by adding to the amount actually received by the taxpayer any tax which another has paid thereon under agreement between the parties?

It is suggested that counsel apply to the Court below for an amendment so that the certificate will show distinctly when the original assessments were made, and under what acts. Also when the appeals were taken to the Board of Tax Appeals; when they were there decided; and when the appeals to the Circuit Court of Appeals were perfected.

And it is further ordered that case No. 407, Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Old Colony Railroad be assigned for argument with the above entitled cause on Monday, April 15 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ella Rawls Reader Stokely, Standard Shales Products Corporation, S. J. Taylor, et al., Appellants, vs. The State of Mississippi, Rush H. Knox, Attorney General; State Hospital Removal, Improvement, and Land Sales Commission, et al.

205 Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, I t is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Douglas, Petitioner, vs. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

312 It is ordered that this case be restored to the docket for reargument on Monday, April 15th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day. In view of the importance of the case, the Attorney General of New York is given leave to file a brief and take part in the oral argument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Sullivan, ex rel. Jee Gim Bew, Petitioner, vs. Anna C. M. Tillinghast, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

599 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Buck Self,
Petitioner,
602 vs.
Prairie Oil & Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Henry Neal, William F. Kennedy,
William R. Sampson et al.,
Trustees, etc., Petitioners,
605 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barber Asphalt Paving Company,
Petitioner,
607 vs.
Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is herdby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Standard Asphalt & Rubber Company, Petitioner,
608 vs.
Barber Asphalt Paving Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew M. Parks, as Trustee, et al., Petitioners,
630 vs.
Charles F. Knapp, as Receiver of the First National Bank of Montevideo.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

290 vs.

William Henry Woolen.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the judgments entered in this cause in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and in the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee be vacated, and that the cause be remanded to the said District Court with instructions to enter judgment in favor of the said William Henry Woolen and against the United States for the sum of $1,485.73, without interest or costs.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, and on motionof Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgments of the said Circuit Court of Appeals and District Court in this cause be, and the same are hereby, vacated; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee with instructions to enter judgment in favor of the said William Henry Woolen and against the United States for the sum of $1,485.73 without interest or costs. Of the amount so awarded to William Henry Woolen $148.57 shall be paid to his counsel for his services in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Okanogan, Methow, San Poelis (or San Poil), Nespelem, Colville and Lake Indian Tribes or Bands of the State of Washington,

Petitioners,

565 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur J. Karnuth, United States Director of Immigration et al., Petitioners,
198 vs.
The United States on the Petition of Preston M. Albro, etc.

On consideration of the motion to pass this cause until Tuesday, March 5th, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: Worcester County National Bank of Worcester, Appellant,
469

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. F. Delano Putnam, leave was granted the Attorney General of the State of Massachusetts to file a brief and to participate in the oral argument of this case.

Old Colony Trust Company, et al., executors,
130 vs.
The Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Warren E. Miller, leave was granted to file a brief of James Walton, as amicus curiae in this case.

E. W. Porter, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Idaho, etc., Petitioner,
617 vs.
The United States.

The motion to extend the time to make deposit to cover cost of printing additional portions of the record in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson for the petitioner.

Pennsylvania Mining Company,
Petitioner,
616 vs.
The United Mine Workers of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Daniel Davenport for the petitioner, leave was granted to file a brief of the petitioner, with leave to the respondent to file an additional brief within one week from this date on motion of Mr. Henry Warrum for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
685 vs.
Joseph Egyed.

On motion of Mr. Morris Cukor in that behalf, the time within which respondent may file a brief was extended one week.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, et al.

On consideration of the motion in behalf of certain defendants herein for leave to file a motion to dismiss the bill of complaint and for leave to file answer of James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, Walter L. Brandt, et al., in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, and James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, et al.

On consideration of the motion of counsel in behalf of the State of Indiana for leave to file an answer in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard L. Davey,
Petitioner,
628 vs.
Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw the appearance of Mr. C. Noyes Slayton as counsel for the respondent in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion

Chin Mon ex rel. Chin Yuen

Petitioner,

203 vs.

Anna C. M. Tillinghast, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the thirteenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Wilcox,

Petitioner,

645 vs.

The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cornelius H. Doherty for the petitioner.

Harry B. Stilz,

Petitioner,

666 vs.

Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Ltd.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry B. Stilz, pro se.

Elizabeth M. Thomas, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,

696 vs.

Maine Central Railroad Company.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund P. Mahoney for the petitioner.

Brietson Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

584 vs.

H. E. Close, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Ben Jenkins, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having filed a motion and having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brietson Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

585 vs.

Mark J. Rosso, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Ben Jenkins, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having filed a motion and having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brictson Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
586 vs.
H. E. Close, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Ben Jenkins, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having filed a motion and having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., et al., Appellant,
563 vs.
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morison R. Waite, Mr. Theodore Schmidt, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. M. C. Roberts, Mr. W. T. Hughes, Mr. C. S. Burg, and Mr. H. H. Larimore for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

International Shoe Company,
Appellant,
579 vs.
Stratton Shartel, Attorney General, etc., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy A. Thompson and Mr. James D. Williamson for the appellant.

J. Earl Morgan,
Petitioner,
208 vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. E. Black, Mr. Chas. C. Russell, and Mr. Perry J. Stearns for the petitioner.

John D. Russell,
Petitioner,
587 vs.
The United States of America.
Lorne R. Adams,
Petitioner,
624 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Branch and Mr. Wm. Schley Howard for [illegible] by Mr. Alex. W. Smith, Jr. for the petitioner in No. 587, petitioner in No. 624, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Osage Nation of Indians,
Petitioner,
591 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. H. Merillat, Mr. C. J. Rappler, and Mr. T. J. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. George T. Stormont for the respondent.

John Fisler,
Petitioner,
597 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Hamilton and Mr. John F. McCarron for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Thomas McMillan, Garnishee,
Petitioner,
603 vs.
National Wool Warehouse & Storage Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver A. Haga for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fremont Wood for the respondent.

Falk Mercantile Company, Limited,
Thomas McMillan, et al.,
Petitioners,
604 vs.
National Wool Warehouse & Storage Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver A. Haga for the petitioners, and by Mr. Fremont Wood for the respondent.

Fred W. Lake and Fannie D. Lake,
Petitioners,
606 vs.
Central Savings Bank of Oakland.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Reagh for the petitioners, and by Mr. R. M. Fitzgerald and Mr. Chas. A. Beardsley for the respondent.

Dr. Paul F. Brown,
Petitioner,
610 vs.
Lane Cotton Mills Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Norman I. Miller for the petitioner.

Dr. Paul F. Brown,
Petitioner,
611 vs.
Lane Cotton Mills Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Norman I. Miller for the petitioner.

The Feather River Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
614 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Trimble and Mr. Jerry A. Mathews for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Lisle A. Smith for the respondent.

Clemente Ariasi,
Petitioner,
615 vs.
Orient Insurance Company and
The Employers' Fire Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy L. Daily for the petitioner, and by Mr. Milton T. U'Ren for the respondents.

Pennsylvania Mining Company, Petitioner,
616 vs.
United Mine Workers of America et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Davenport, Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt, and Mr. John W. Simpson, 2d, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry Warrum for the respondents.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
619 vs.
Nick Mihas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, and/or the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David H. Leake for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Bramhall for the respondent.

New York & New Jersey Steamboat Company, Petitioner,
620 vs.
Frederick H. Schomburg.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
621 vs
Guardian Trust Company, Henry C. Flower, Receiver.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Moore, Mr. Cyrus Crane, Mr. A. F. Smith, and Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the petitioner.

General Insurance Company of America, Petitioner,
622 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. Howe for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. F. Lyons for the respondent.

J. Bradfore Erb, Petitioner,
626 vs.
Claremont Laboratories, Inc. and Capitol Machine Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. H. Yeatman and Mr. Wilton J. Lambert for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. P. Goepel for the respondents.

Stearns Brothers, Inc., Petitioner,
627 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Robinson for the respondent.

Richard L. Davey, Petitioner,
628 vs.
Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dougal Herr for the petitioner, and by Mr. Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., for the respondents.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator of the Estate of C. E. Barford, deceased, Petitioner,
629 vs.
The United States of America and Colonna's Shipyard, Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz for the petitioner.

Kar-Lac Company and Julius H. Karlson, Petitioners,
636 vs.
The Gilchrist Company and Hamilton-Beach Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hervey S. Knight and Mr. George L. Wilkinson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Fred Gerlach for the respondents.

Joseph Frank Murphy, Petitioner,
637 vs.
India Tire & Rubber Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. M. Pardue for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Davis for the respondent.

Vincenzo Madonna and Enrico Iannarelli, Administrators of the personal estate of Francisco Galzana, etc., Petitioners,
638 vs.
Wheeling Steel Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Raymond Gordon for the petitioners.

Foreman Trust & Savings Bank, Administrator of the estate of Kazimir Prosclevich, deceased, Petitioner,
639 vs.
Grand Trunk Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, and/or the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert H. Patterson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Y. Freeman and Mr. Louis L. Dent for the respondent.

Walter S. Dickey, Petitioner,
640 vs.
William Volker, J. C. Nichols, and Herbert V. Jones, as University Trustees, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James T. Blair, Mr. Leland Hazard, , and Mr. Maurice H. Winger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry L. McCune, Mr. Henry A. Bundschu, Mr. Cyrus Crane, Mr. I. M. Watson, Mr. Samuel W. Sawyer, Mr. Harry M. Ess, Mr. George O. Pratt, and Mr. Mat J. Holland for the respondents.

John Arthur Boyd, Fred Nourse, et al., Petitioners,
641 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ ofcertiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

J. C. Fullerton and M. W. Dobson, Petitioners,
643 vs.
The Eagle-Picher Lead Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Ramsey and Mr. Ray McNaughton for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. C. Wallace for the respondent.

George D. Brown, sole surviving Administrator of the Estate of I. N. Brown, deceased, et al., Petitioners,
644 vs.
Joseph A. Gamble, Receiver, etc.
P. S. Perkins, I. C. Bishop, and O. O. Sutton, Petitioners,
680 vs.
Joseph A. Gamble, Receiver, etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. E. Haymond for the petitioners in No. 644; by Mr. P. S. Perkins, pro se, in No. 680; and by Mr. D. C. T. Davis, Jr., for the respondent.

Colonna Shipyard, Inc., Petitioner,
646 vs.
J. F. Dunn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and/or the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell and Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. A. Banks for the respondent.

David S. Barry, Sergeant at Arms of the U. S. Senate, et al., Petitioners,
647 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the petitioners, and by Mr. Benjamin M. Golder and Mr. Ruby R. Vale for the respondent.

Federal Surety Company, Petitioner,
651 vs.
City of Staunton, Illinois, suing for the use and benefit of McWane Cast Iron Pipe Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Brower, Mr. John London, and Mr. George W. Yancey for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. H. Cabaniss for the respondent.

Thomas Graham and Atlantic City Building Block Corporation, Petitioners,
654 vs.
Crozier-Straub, Inc., and Concrete Specialties Co.
Jacob Melmod and Seashore Brick & Building Block Company, Petitioners,
655 vs.
Crozier-Straub, Inc., and Concrete Specialties Co.
Robert G. Downer, Petitioner,
656 vs.
Crozier-Straub, Inc., and Concrete Specialties Co.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen S. Olmsted, 2d and Mr. Walter Biddle Saul for the petitioners.

Harry H. DeLoss, Petitioner,
657 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, Mr. Charles F. Swindler, and Mr. Samuel W. McIntosh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. C. M. Charest and Mr. Allen H. Pierce for the respondent.

Lewis G. Morton, Petitioner,
660 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmenter, Mr. E. O. Patterson, and Mr. E. T. Burke for the respondent.

Era Electrical Supply Corporation, Petitioner,
670 vs.
Metropolitan Device Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Anthony Usina for the respondent.

Charles F. Fiman, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
671 vs.
The State of South Dakota.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard G. Fuller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray F. Drewry for the respondent.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1929 - CONTINUED

Harry F. Sinclair
555 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Martin W. Littleton for Sinclair.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Willis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Pine, It is ordered that Frank H. Bryan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Lloyd F. Loux, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Semmes, It is ordered that Montgomery W. McConkey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Selby, It is ordered that Rodney S. Cohen, Esquire, of Augusta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Darby, It is ordered that Harry P. Jennings and Louis Wilmer Helmuth, Sr., Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence M. Cake, It is ordered that Robert Sidney Outlaw, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max Rhoade, It is ordered that Sam H. Platcow, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Tatgenhorst, Jr., It is ordered that Thomas L. Tallentire, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. E. Borah, It is ordered that Frank Martin, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Doyle, It is ordered that George A. Burns, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer O. Leatherwood, It is ordered that William J. Lowe, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, It is ordered that Norman S. Sterry, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that C. Penton Nichols, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Andrew Flink,

Petitioner,

299 vs.

Attilio Paladini et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake in behalf of Mr. Louis T. Hengstler, leave was granted to file a brief of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Company, as amicus curiae in this case.

John A. McKay,

Appellant,

322 vs.

Hector McInnes, Stuart Jenks, L. A. Lovett, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw the appearances of Mr. Paul B. Cromelin and Mr. Bolitha J. Laws as counsel for the appellant in this cause, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry F. Sinclair
555 vs.
The United States of America.

Mr. George P. Hoover for Sinclair.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Atlee Pomerene and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the United States of America, and concluded by

The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants,
355 vs.
Anchor Coal Company et al.
Barton Coal Company, et al., Appellants,
356 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.
Pittsburgh Operators' Lake Rate Committee et al., Appellants,
357 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
358 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; continued by Mr. Henry Wolf Bikle for the appellants in No. 358; by Mr. Ernest S. Ballard for the appellants in No. 356; and by Mr. August C. Gutheim for the appellants in No. 357.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Morris, It is ordered that Henry B. Morrow, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, It is ordered that S. Harrison White, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America and
The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
355 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.
Barton Coal Company, et al.,
Appellants,
356 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. August C. Gutheim for the appellants in No.357; by Mr. J. V. Norman for the appellees, Anchor Coal Company et al.; by Mr. Luther M. Walter for appellants, The United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. C. R. Hillyer for appellees Whiting-Plover Paper Company, et al;

Pittsburgh Operators' Lake Rate Committee et al., Appellants,
357 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
358 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.

by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellees, Anchor Coal Company et al.; and concluded by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the appellants, The United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission. Leave granted counsel to file briefs within five days.

County of Spokane and County of Whitman, Washington, Petitioners,
164 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles W. Greenough for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence J. Heller, It is ordered that Eli S. Wolbarst, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ellsworth C. Alvord, It is ordered that Charles B. Stewart, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that Earl Q. Gray, Esquire, of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Marion N. Chrestman, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John Johnson,
Petitioner,
220 vs.
The United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, Leave was granted to Mr. Myron Scott to appear and present argument for the petitioner pro hac vice.

Andrew Flink,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Attilio Paladini et al.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Hutton and Mr. R. T. Lynch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ira S. Lillick for the respondents.

County of Spokane and County of Whitman, Washington,
Petitioners,
164 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles W. Greenough for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The State of Alabama and Alabama Public Service Commission,
Appellants,
166 vs.
The United States of America, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellants, continued by Mr. E. M. Reidy for the appellees, The United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Frank W. Grathmey for appellees, the Alabama Carriers; and concluded by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellants.

John Johnson,

Petitioner,

220 vs.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

This case was argued by Mr. Myron Scott for the petitioner pro hac vice by special leave of Court, and by Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

The United States,

Petitioner,

238 vs.

The New York Central Railroad, lessee of the Boston and Albany Railroad;

The United States,

Petitioner,

304 vs.

Nevada County Narrow Gauge Railroad Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that Sam McCorkle, Esquire, of Mexia, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eliot C. Lovett, It is ordered that Harold A. Smith, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur E. Sutherland, It is ordered that Arthur VD Chamberlain, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph Gilbert, It is ordered that James M. Gilbert, Esquire, of Frankfort, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Broussard, It is ordered that Wood H. Thompson and Percy Saint, Esquires, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Bertram I. Cahn, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Henry B. Curtis, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Montague, It is ordered that Henry R. Miller, Jr., Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

E. W. Porter, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Idaho, Liquidating Agent of the Citizens State Bank of Buhl, Idaho,

Petitioner,

617 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for an extension of time within which to make deposit to cover the cost of printing the record in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Wilcox,

Petitioner,

645 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Wilcox,

Petitioner,

645 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry B. Stilz,

Petitioner,

666 vs.

Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Ltd.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry B. Stilz,
Petitioner,
666 vs.
Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth M. Thomas, as Administratrix of the Estate of Oscar R. Thomas, deceased, Petitioner,
696 vs.
Maine Central Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth M. Thomas, as Administratrix of the Estate of Oscar R. Thomas, deceased, Petitioner,
696 vs.
Maine Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
104 vs.
Florence E. Williams.

It is now here ordered that the costs incurred by the respondent in this cause, in this Court, shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody pursuant to the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.,
Appellants,
563 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Shoe Company,
Appellant,
579 vs.
Stratton Shartel, Attorney General of the State of Missouri, et al., etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Osage Nation of Indians,
Appellant,
591 vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Courtof Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Osage Nation of Indians,
Petitioner,
591 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
619 vs.
Nick Mihas.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District, State of Illinois, and/or the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
621 vs.
Guardian Trust Company, Henry C. Flower, Receiver.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Insurance Company of America, Petitioner,
622 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator of the Estate of C. E. Barford, deceased, Petitioner,
629 vs.
The United States of America and Colonna's Shipyard, Incorporated.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David S. Barry, Sergeant-at-Arms of the U. S. Senate, and John J. McGrain, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, Petitioners,
647 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Earl Morgan, Petitioner,
208 vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John D. Russell, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

587

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lorne R. Adams, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

624

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Fisler, Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

597

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas McMillan, Garnishee,
Petitioner,
603 vs.
National Wool Warehouse & Storage Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fulk Mercantile Company, Limited, Thomas McMillan, The Boise City National Bank, et al.,
Petitioners,
604 vs.
National Wool Warehouse & Storage Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred W. Lake and Fannie D. Lake,
Petitioners,
606 vs.
Central Savings Bank of Oakland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dr. Paul F. Brown,
Petitioner,
610 vs.
Lane Cotton Mills Company, W. E. Floding, Miss Mary Floding, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dr. Paul F. Brown,
Petitioner,
611 vs.
Lane Cotton Mills Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Feather River Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

614 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clemente Ariasi,

Petitioner,

615 vs.

Orient Insurance Company and The Employers' Fire Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York & New Jersey Steamboat Company, Petitioner,

620 vs.

Frederick H. Schomburg.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Bradfore Erb,

Petitioner,

626 vs.

Claremont Laboratories, Inc., and Capitol Machine Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Stearns Brothers, Inc.,

Petitioner,

627 vs.

Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard L. Davey,

Petitioner,

628 vs.

Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company and Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kar-Lac Company and Julius H. Karlson, Petitioners,
636 vs.
The Gilchrist Company and Hamilton-Beach Manufacturing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Frank Murphy, Petitioner,
637 vs.
India Tire & Rubber Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vincenzo Madonna and Enrico Iannarelli, Administrators of the personal estate of Francisco Balzana, etc., Petitioners,
638 vs.
Wheeling Steel Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Foreman Trust & Savings Bank,
Administrator of the estate of
Kazimir Proscievich, deceased,
Petitioner,
639 vs.
Grand Trunk Western Railway
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois and/or the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the first District of the State of Illinois and/or the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter S. Dickey,
Petitioner,
640 vs.
William Volker, J. C. Nichols and
Herbert V. Jones, as University
Trustees, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Arthur Boyd, Fred Mourse,
Daniel George Huron, et al.,
Petitioners,
641 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. C. Fullerton and W. W. Dobson,
Petitioners,
643 vs.
The Eagle-Picher Lead Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Brown, sole surviving Administrator of the Estate of I. N. Brown, deceased, I. C. Bishop, P. S. Perkins, et al.,
Petitioners,
644 vs.
Joseph A. Gamble, Receiver of the First National Bank of Sutton, West Virginia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. S. Perkins, I. C. Bishop
and O. O. Sutton,

Petitioners,

680 vs.

Joseph A. Gamble, Receiver of
the First National Bank of Sutton,
West Virginia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Colonna Shipyard, Inc.,

Petitioner,

646 vs.

J. F. Dunn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Special Court of Appeals, State of Virginia, and/or the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and/or the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Surety Company,

Petitioner,

651 vs.

City of Staunton, Illinois, suing for the use and benefit of McWane Cast Iron Pipe Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas Graham and Atlantic City Building Block Corporation,

Petitioners,

654 vs.

Crozier-Straub, Inc., and Concrete Specialties Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob Melmod and Seashore Brick & Building Block Company,

Petitioners,

655 vs.

Crozier-Straub, Inc., and Concrete Specialties Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the

Robert G. Downer,
Petitioner,
656 vs.
Crozier-Straub, Inc., and Concrete Specialties Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry H. De Loss,
Petitioner,
657 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lewis G. Morton,
Petitioner,
660 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Era Electrical Supply Corporation,
Petitioner,
670 vs.
Metropolitan Device Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles F. Fiman, as Receiver of the National Bank of Commerce of Pierre, South Dakota,
Petitioner,
671 vs.
The State of South Dakota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Roschen,
Appellant,
667 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General, etc., et al.
S.S. Kresge Company,
Appellant,
668 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General, etc., et al.

The motions to advance these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stanley D. Willis in behalf of Mr. Walter N. Seligsberg for the appellants.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
California Co-operative Canneries.

The motion for leave to file a brief of the National Wholesale Grocers' Association of the United States, as amicus curiae in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker in behalf of Mr. William C. Breed, Mr. Sumner Ford, and Mr. Edward A. Craighill, Jr.

The United States of America, et al.,
Appellants,
355 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.
Barton Coal Company, et al.,
Appellants,
356 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.
Pittsburgh Operators' Lake Rate Committee, et al.,
Appellants,
357 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al.,
Appellants,
358 vs.
Anchor Coal Company, et al.

The motion for an extension of time within which to file an additional brief for the appellees was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Quirk for the appellees, and the motion was denied.

The St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,
Appellant,
568 vs.
Alabama Public Service Commission,
Hugh White, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. C. Cocke for the appellant.

J. V. Burke,
Appellant,
572 vs.
State of Oregon.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Mannix for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. George Mowry/for the appellee in opposition thereto. Mr. Leon Behrman and Mr. Stanley Myers

The Macallen Company,
Appellant,
578 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard H. Wiswall and Mr. Thomas Allen for the appellant.

Karl Herbring,
Appellant,
590 vs.
Claire A. Lee, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy E. Kelly for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle and Mr. Willis J. Moore for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

The People of the State of New York, Appellant,
601 vs.
Gumble Latrobe, Jr., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hamilton Ward, Mr. Wendell P. Brown, and Mr. Robert P. Beyer for the appellants.

Alexander Sprunt & Son, Inc., et al., Appellants,
612 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. C. Fulbright for the appellants.

Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc., Petitioner,
648 vs.
Westgate Sea Products Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Newby for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Graham for the respondent.

Andrew Donovan, Petitioner,
649 vs.
Frank D. Comerford.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. D. Cash for the petitioner.

Anna M. Jensen, Petitioner,
658 vs.
Continental Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Donelley for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Calvin Chesnut for the respondent.

The Oswego and Syracuse Railroad Company, Petitioner,
659 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Jenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Morton P. Fisher for the respondent.

The New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner,
664 vs.
Ed Peele.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell P. Harker and Mr. Walter A. Eversman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert Ward for the respondent.

The Village of Lowellville, Ohio, Petitioner,
665 vs.
The East End Traction Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Mahoning County, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. J. Melillo for the petitioner, and by Mr. Union C. DeFord for the respondent.

Edward J. Gunning, Petitioner,
672 vs.
Gertrude L. Cooley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, and Mr. Arthur P. Drury for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer for the respondent.

The United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, etc., et al., Petitioners,
676 vs.
Benjamin Lustgarten, an infant, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Chauncey G. Parker, and Mr. F. R. Conway for the petitioners, and by Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the respondent.

D. Basil O'Connor,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Basil O'Connor pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.

E. W. Porter, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Idaho, Liquidating Agent of the Citizens State Bank of Buhl, Idaho,
Petitioner,
617 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the petitioner have failed to make the deposit to cover the cost of printing the record in this cause as required by the rules of this Court,

Therefore, in pursuance of the thirteenth rule of this Court, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,
Petitioner,
238 vs.
The New York Central Railroad, lessee of the Boston and Albany Railroad.
The United States,
Petitioner,
304 vs.
Nevada County Narrow Gauge Railroad Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the respondents and concluded by Mr. George H. Fernald, Jr. for the respondents.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, and the California Growers' & Shippers' Protective League.

273

This case was argued by Mr. Herman Phleger for the appellants; by Mr. J. Stanley Payne for the United States and Interstate Commerce Commission, and by Mr. Allan P. Matthew for the California Growers' & Shippers' Protective League.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Robinson, It is ordered that Henry H. Johnson, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland; Robert H. Archer, Esquire, of Belair, State of Maryland; and W. Calvin Trice, Esquire, of Cambridge, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard N. Elliott, It is ordered that Ralph E. Updike, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, and Clifton A. Woodrum, Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Woolsey, It is ordered that Samuel D. Stein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James T. Crouch, It is ordered that Clarence R. Ahalt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Leland H. Sabin, Esquire, of Battle Creek, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, It is ordered that Meyer M. Semel, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Leahy, It is ordered that Geo. M. Burditt, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original, vs.
The State of Kansas, et al.

On consideration of the motion to extend the time to April 8th next, within which to file the answer of the defendants in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. McKay, Appellant, 322 vs. Hector McInnes, Stuart Jenks, et al.	This case was passed for submission on printed briefs on Monday, April 8th next.
Ohio Oil Company, Appellant, 514 vs. E.A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Wood H. Thompson for the appellee. Further consideration postponed until Wednesday, February 27.
Juan Posados, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner, 251 vs. Warner, Barnes & Co., Ltd.; Juan Posados, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner, 252 vs. J. M. Menzi.	These cases were argued by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Martin Taylor for the respondents.
Ivy L. Leonard and Thomas B. Leonard, copartners, etc., Plaintiffs in error and appellants, 260 vs. Swepson Marle, Conservation Commissioner, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William L. Rawls for the plaintiffs in error and appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that Lester G. Hunt, Esquire, of Holly Springs, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Burditt, It is ordered that John K. Murphy, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles K. Wheeler, It is ordered that James G. Wheeler, Esquire, of Paducah, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that E. Howard Morphy, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell, It is ordered that Carl W. Cummins, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh , It is ordered that Alva C. Baird, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, and Francis P. Kelly, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

Ohio Oil Company,

Appellant,

514 vs.

E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

O R D E R

In order that the Court may further examine the questions presented in this cause, consideration thereof is postponed until Tuesday next, March 5, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ivy L. Leonard and Thomas B. Leonard, copartners, etc.,

Plaintiffs in error and appellants,

260 vs.

Swepson Earle, Conservation Commissioner of Maryland, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William L. Rawls for the plaintiffs in error and appellants, by Mr. Robert H. Archer for the defendant in error and appellee, and concluded by Mr. Thomas H. Robinson for the defendant in error and appellee.

Ithaca Trust Company, Sole Surviving Executor & Trustee, etc., Petitioner, 267 vs. The United States.	This case was argued by Mr. A. F. Prescott, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Mitchell for the respondent.
W. A. Marshall & Co., Inc., Petitioner, 272 vs. Steamship "President Arthur", her engines, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George Wright Hinckley for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. John M. Woolsey and Mr. Samuel D. Stein for the respondent. The Court declined to hear further argument.
James R. Helson and Clyde Randolph, doing business, etc., Plaintiffs in error, 296 vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky, by Milton Board, Revenue Agent, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James C. Wheeler for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Harrison White, It is ordered that Clifford D. Davidson, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, and Charles Clyde Barker, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Titus, It is ordered that Felix T. Smith, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt, It is ordered that Joseph B. Conwell, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, It is ordered that S. T. Lowe, Esquire, of Burley, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., it is ordered that Sol A. Rosenblatt, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ohio Oil Company,
Appellant,
514 vs.
E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake in behalf of Mr. S. L. Herold for the appellant, leave was granted to file a supplemental brief for the appellant.

James R. Nelson and Clyde Randolph, doing business, etc.,
Plaintiffs in error,
296 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky, by Milton Board, Revenue Agent for the State at Large.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. James G. Wheeler for the plaintiffs in error and concluded by Mr. James M. Gilbert for the defendant in error.

Carson Petroleum Company,
Petitioner,
306 vs.
Leon C. Vial, Sheriff, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. George M. Burditt and Mr. John K. Murphy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry P. Sneed for the respondent.

Leon Sampere,

Plaintiff in error and appellant,

321 vs.

The City of New Orleans.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Winans Wall for the plaintiff in error and appellant, and continued by Mr. Henry B. Curtis and Mr. Bertrand I. Cahn for the defendant in error and appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Jenkins, It is ordered that Warren F. Brumfield, Esquire, of Perry, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that James E. Whitehead, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that C. E. Hall, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
482 vs.
J. Harry Wiener.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Preston B. Kavanaugh in behalf of Mr. Herman A. Fischer, Jr., and Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, leave was granted to file a brief of Herman A. Fischer, Jr., and E. Barrett Prettyman, as amici curiae in this case.

Leon Sampere,
Plaintiff in error,
321 vs.
The City of New Orleans.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Bertrand I. Cahn for the defendant in error and appellee, and concluded by Mr. William Winans Wall for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Pampanga Sugar Mills,
Petitioner,
325 vs.
Wenceslas Trinidad, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands.

This case was argued by Mr. Louis Titus for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the respondent.

Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas, Petitioner,
335 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Rigby for the respondent.

John Martin Riehle, as Receiver in Equity of the Morosco Holding Company, Inc., Petitioner,
347 vs.
Edward Margolies.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. F. Wright Moxley for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 11.20 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess to attend the inauguration of the President of the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer C. Sharp, It is ordered that James A. Lauderdale, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Brien, It is ordered that Daniel A. Rush, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julius Martin, It is ordered that Julius Martin II, Esquire, of Ashville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Kappler, It is ordered that Isaac Prohman, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moultrie Hitt, It is ordered that Joseph W. Planck, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Carroll, It is ordered that Russell B. James, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney C. Murray, It is ordered that Marvin A. Jersild and Leo P. Day, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry McCall, It is ordered that George Piazza, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Henry A. Macbeth, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Vincent G. Hart, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Huddleston, It is ordered that Floelle Y. Bonner, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that Junius Jaye Truax and Stanley Sloane Gillam, Esquires, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Harry H. Meisner, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Burton, It is ordered that Arthur Krause, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio; Nolan Boggs, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio; Robert J. Shawhan, Esquire, of Lebanon, State of Ohio; and Frank E. Calkins, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Whittington, It is ordered that Samuel I. Osborn, Esquire, of Greenwood, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Emily Marx, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philander D. Swing, It is ordered that Arthur T. George, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Lee G. Carter, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Melendez King, It is ordered that John W. Schenck, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Allie E. Lewis, and William Lloyd Lewis, Petitioners,
182 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Andrew Flink,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Attilio Paladini, Hugo Paladini, Ercelia Paladini, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

William Roschen,
Appellant,
667 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.
S. S. Kresge Company,
Appellant,
668 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the causes placed upon the summary docket, and assigned for argument as one case on Monday, April 8 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
California Cooperative Canneries.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a brief of the National Wholesale Grocers' Association as amicus curiae herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,
Appellant,
568 vs.
Alabama Public Service Commission et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

The Macallen Company,
Appellant,
578 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Karl Herbring,
Appellant,
590 vs.
Claire A. Lee, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the statements as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The People of the State of New York, Appellants,
601 vs.
Gamble Latrobe, Jr., et al.

On consideration of the statment as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Sprunt & Son, Inc., et al., Appellants,
612 vs.
The United States of America et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. V. Burke,
Appellant,
572 vs.
The State of Oregon.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Leon Sampere,

Plaintiff in error and appellant,

321 vs.

The City of New Orleans.

In error to and appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants,

355 vs.

Anchor Coal Company, American Eagle Colliery, American Rolling Mill Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint without costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sanford took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Barton Coal Company, Bellaire Mining Company, Big Five Coal Company, et al., Appellants, vs. Anchor Coal Company, American Eagle Colliery, American Rolling Mill Company, et al.

356 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint without costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sanford took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Pittsburgh Operators' Lake Rate Committee et al., Appellants, vs. Anchor Coal Company, American Eagle Colliery, American Rolling Mill Company, et al.

357 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia with directions to dismiss the bill

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company, New York Central Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,

358 vs.

Anchor Coal Company, American Eagle Colliery, American Rolling Mill Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint without costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Sanford took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Ohio Oil Company, Appellant,

514 vs.

E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
California Cooperative Canneries.

It is ordered that these cases heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, March 11 next, be, and they are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, April 15 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Magnolia Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error and appellant,
148 vs.
Graves Leeper, as Secretary of State, etc.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward J. Gunning,
Petitioner,
672 vs.
Gertrude L. Cooley,

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, sued in the name of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, et al.,
Petitioners,
676 vs.
Benjamin Lustgarten, an infant, by his Guardian Ad Litem, John A. Lydecker.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. Basil O'Connor,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pennsylvania Mining Company,
Petitioner,
616 vs.
United Mine Workers of America, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
648 vs.
Westgate Sea Products Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew Donovan,
Petitioner,
649 vs.
Frank D. Comerford.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna M. Jensen,
Petitioner,
658 vs.
Continental Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Oswego and Syracuse Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
659 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Ed Peele. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana.

664

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Village of Lowellville, Ohio, Petitioner, vs. The East End Traction Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Mahoning County, State of Ohio.

665

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Mahoning County, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order.

O R D E R

The Court will take a recess from Monday, March 11, until Monday, April 8 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Utah.

The motion to appoint a Special Master was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the complainant.

David S. Barry, Sergeant-at-Arms of the U. S. Senate, et al.,
Petitioners,
647 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the petitioners.

Walter W. Abell, Elizabeth M. Abell, et al., Petitioners,
719 vs.
Galen L. Tait, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. James Craig Peacock, leave was granted to file a brief of James Craig Peacock, Harry Friedman, and W. W. Spalding, as amici curiae.

Old Colony Trust Company et al., executors,
130 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, leave was granted to file a brief of the Committee on Federal Taxation of the American Bar Association, as amicus curiae.

Ex Parte: Worcester County National Bank of Worcester, Appellant.
469

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. George P. Barse, leave was granted to file a brief of John W. Pole, Comptroler of the Currency of the United States, as amicus curiae.

Ex Parte: Worcester County National Bank of Worcester, Appellant.
469

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of Mr. Carl Meyer, leave was granted to file a brief of the Continental National Bank and Trust Company of Chicago, as amicus curiae.

Ex Parte: Worcester County National Bank of Worcester, Appellant.
469

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Walter Wyatt, leave was granted to file a brief of the Federal Reserve Board, as amicus curiae.

Ex Parte: Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner.
——, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Foster Blair in behalf of Mr. F. B. Crier, Mr. W. E. May, and Mr. Robert C. Alston for the petitioner.

Ruth Anne Bundy, Petitioner,
728 vs.
Walter L. Bundy.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Ruth Ann Bundy, pro se.

Safe Deposit and Trust Company of Baltimore, Maryland, Appellant,
618 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Hurt, Jr., for the appellant.

The United States of America, ex rel. Joseph Wenger, Appellant, vs. W. Frank Mathues, United States Marshal, etc.

631

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Blank for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Safe Deposit and Trust Company of Baltimore, Maryland, Petitioner, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia.

618

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Hurt, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. W. Martin and Mr. Henry R. Miller, Jr., for the respondent.

Corning Distilling Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

625

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke and Mr. George H. Beneman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Edward F. Goltra, Petitioner, vs. Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War, etc., et al.

661

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph T. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell and Mr. Lon O. Hocker for the respondent.

Anthony Minerich,
Petitioner,
669 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Sharts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Donovan for the respondent.

Townsend Estates, Inc., and Pittsburgh Incinerator Manufacturing Co., Inc., Petitioners,
673 vs.
Kerner Incinerator Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Frease for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lawrence A. Janney for the respondent.

Alta Matthews, Administratrix of Dixon Matthews, deceased,
Petitioner,
677 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. McConnell for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. E. Jeffries, Mr. S. R. Prince, and Mr. H. O'B. Cooper for the respondent.

Massachusetts Fire & Marine Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
679 vs.
Jake Schneider, Proprietor of Fairfax Department Store.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore A. Hammond, Mr. Alex. W. Smith, Jr., and Mr. W. M. Howard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Rodney S. Cohen for the respondent.

Richmond Hosiery Mills,
Petitioner,
681 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam E. Whitaker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Percy S. Crewe for the respondent.

Red Star Towing & Transportation Company, as owner of the Steam tug "Bronx", Petitioner,
683 vs.
New Jersey Shipbuilding and Dredging Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward Ash for the respondent.

Morris H. Elvidge,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Stelwagon Manufacturing Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Armitage for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry W. Mack for the respondent.

The State of Ohio on the relation of John C. Popovici, Vice Consul of Roumania, Petitioner,
686 vs.
Abram W. Agler, Charles Krichbaum, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Atlee Pomerene and Mr. Frank Harrison for the petitioner.

Wabash Railway Company, Myron S. Hall, et al., Petitioners,
693 vs.
John C. Barclay and Willoughby Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. Winslow S. Pierce, and Mr. F. C. Nicodemus, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wm. R. Begg, Mr. Ellis Ames Ballard, and Mr. Joseph S. Clark for the respondents.

Shirley P. Austin, Petitioner,
694 vs.
John C. Barclay and Willoughby Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. R. Begg, Mr. Ellis Ames Ballard, and Mr. Joseph S. Clark for the respondents.

Claude C. Sill, Successor of Edgar Freeman Anderson, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
705 vs.
William Bell Raiford Pennington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Victor L. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marion Smith for the respondent.

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1929 - CONTINUED

American Valve & Meter Company and Edward E. Johnson, Petitioners, vs. Fairbanks, Morse & Company. 722

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. A. Whiteley, Mr. Richard P. Ernst, and Mr. Alfred C. Cassatt for the petitioners, and by Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the respondent.

District of Columbia, Petitioner, vs. Georgiana Thompson, 723

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Bride for the petitioner.

John Martin Riehle, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner, vs. Edward Margolies. 347

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Sol A. Rosenblatt for the respondent.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. American Livestock Commission Company, Lewis Barefoot, etc., et al. 513

This case was argued by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the appellant, and by Mr. C. E. Hall for the appellees.

Arthur J. Karnuth, United States Director of Immigration, and Charles Dreher, Inspector, etc., Petitioners,
198 vs.
United States of America, on the petition of Preston M. Albro, as Attorney for Mary Cook and [illegible] Antonio Danelon.

This case was argued by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Preston M. Albro for the respondent.

Joe Tin Lun, by next friend, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
74 vs.
W. F. Bond, State Superintendent of Education, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. James A. Lauderdale for the defendants in error, and submitted by Mr. James M. Flowers for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien, It is ordered that John Jay Hopkins, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl W. Cummins, It is ordered that Price Wickersham, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert B. Keenan, It is ordered that Jack W. Hayes, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. S. Goen, It is ordered that H. L. McCune, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert B. Keenan, It is ordered that George B. Schwabe, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom D. McKeown, It is ordered that H. M. Carr, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Free, It is ordered that Harry K. Wolff, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, and George Robert Freeman, Esquire, of Riverside, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garland S. Ferguson, It is ordered that William Johnson Hannah, Esquire, of Waynesville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael M. Doyle, It is ordered that Pius P. Flick, Esquire, of Riverdale, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Farrington, It is ordered that Copal Mintz, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Schwertner, It is ordered that George J. Feldman and Benjamin Spinoza, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Waters, Jr., It is ordered that William A. Booker, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Serverino Alberto,
Petitioner,
364 vs.
Bonifacio Nicolas.

This case was argued by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry J. Richardson for the respondent.

The United States Printing and Lithograph Co., Petitioner,
372 vs.
Griggs, Cooper and Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Walter F. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. H. Morphy and Mr. C. W. Cummins for the respondent.

Sutter Butte Canal Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
403 vs.
The Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Isaac Frohman for the plaintiff in error.

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bolitha J. Laws, It is ordered that Cloyd Laporte, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Strong, It is ordered that Owen S. Samuel, Esquire, of Emporia, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Burke, It is ordered that Herbert F. O'Hare, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Mostetler, It is ordered that Albert J. Fihe, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. McNeill, It is ordered that William L. Reed, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that William L. Erwin, Esquire, of Athens, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sutter Butte Canal Co.,
Plaintiff in error,
403 vs.
The Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Isaac Frohman for the plaintiff in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
414 vs.
Aaron A. B. Chatters.
Southern Railway Company, et al, Petitioners,
415 vs.
Aaron A. B. Chatters.

These cases were argued by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe for the petitioner in No. 415; by Mr. Harry McCall for the petitioner in No. 414; and by Mr. George Piazza for the respondent.

Morris & Company et al.,
Petitioners,
450 vs.
Skandinavia Insurance Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Garner Wynn Green for the petitioners, and by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the respondent.

London Guarantee and Accident Co., Ltd., Appellant,
491 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Leo C. Weiler for the appellant, and by Mr. George C. Faulkner, Jr., for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. A. Smith, It is ordered that Harvey M. Burns, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph S. Collins, It is ordered that Joseph B. Lieb, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; Edward Patrick Guinane, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin; and W. Carlton Gorsuch, Esquire, of Oxford, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that W. Maynard Stapleton, Esquire, of Lewisburg, State of Pennsylvania, and Maurice W. Monheimer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy C. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Karl T. Stauffer, Esquire, of Homeworth, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert H. Patterson, It is ordered that Joseph D. Ryan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Hickey, It is ordered that Robert C. Hillis, Esquire, of Logansport, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George V. Triplett, It is ordered that Elwood Hamilton, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Harry F.Sinclair, Henry Mason Day, William J. Burns, W. Sherman Burns,
748 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein and to advance the case for argument on Monday, April 22, next, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co., Petitioner,

454 vs.

John Rock.

This case was argued by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. H. Patterson for the respondent.

New York Central R. R. Co., Petitioner,

455 vs.

Edward H. Johnson.

New York Central R. R. Co., Petitioner,

456 vs.

Myrtle J. Johnson.

These cases were argued by Mr. Sidney C. Murray and Mr. Albert S. Marley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Price Wickersham for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond Jones, It is ordered that Birney B. Hines, Esquire, of Wilkinsburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell, It is ordered that George M. Wilmeth, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Frank H. Pardee, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts; and Benjamin Harrison McKinley, Esquire, of Lowell, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Earl Van Wagoner, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Donald C. O'Regan, It is ordered that Edward Lee Mearns, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, It is ordered that Edward C. Bailly, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that Homer Hoch, Esquire, of Marion, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that Edna Clary, of Shawnee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Thomas R. Freeman, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Afred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Neil Burkinshaw, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Henry D. Gaggstatter, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Special Assistant to the Attorney General Wheat presented the Honorable William D. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States, and it was ordered that his commission be recorded.

Which said commission is in the words and figures following, viz:

"HERBERT HOOVER

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To all who shall see these presents, Greeting:

Know ye, that reposing special trust and confidence in the Patriotism, Integrity and Abilities of WILLIAM DEWITT MITCHELL, of Minnesota, I have nominated, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him ATTORNEY GENERAL, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to law, and to have and to hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto him the said WILLIAM DEWITT MITCHELL, during the pleasure of the President of the United States, for the time being.

In Testimony whereof, I have caused these Letters to be made Patent, and the Seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this fifth day of March, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-third.

By the President:

FRANK B. KELLOGG,

Secretary of State.

HERBERT HOOVER".

The United States,

Petitioner,

238 vs.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Lessee of the Boston & Albany Railroad.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States,

Petitioner,

304 vs.

Nevada County Narrow Gauge Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,

Complainant,

15, Original vs.

The State of Utah.

O R D E R

On consideration of the motion by the United States for the appointment of a Special Master to take the evidence in this case and report the same to this Court with his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for a decree,

It is now here ordered that Charles Warren, of Washington, D.C.., be, and he is hereby, appointed a Special Master with the powers of a Master in Chancery, as provided in the rules of this Court, to take the evidence viva voce or by deposition and to report the same to the Court with his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for a decree—all subject to examination, consideration, approval, modification, or other disposal by the Court.

The Special Master shall have authority (1) to employ competent stenographic and clerical assistants, (2) to fix the times and places of taking the evidence and to limit the time within which each party shall present its evidence, and (3) to issue subpoenas to secure the attendance of witnesses and to administer oaths. Depositions of witnesses residing at any place may be taken upon stipulation of the parties, or by the mode provided in the rules of practice for the Courts of Equity of the United States, or as provided by sections 863, 865-867 of the Revised Statutes for the taking of depositions de bene esse in the District Courts, or as may be directed by the Master. They may be returned in the first instance to the Master. When the Special Master's report of his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for a decree is completed, the Clerk of the Court shall cause the same to be printed; and when the same is presented to the Court in printed form, the parties will be accorded a reasonable time, to be fixed by the Court, within which to present exceptions. The Special Master shall be allowed his actual expenses and a reasonable compensation for his services, to be fixed hereafter by the Court. The allowances to him, the compensation paid to his stenographic and clerical assistants, and the cost of printing his report shall be charged against and be borne by the parties in such proportions as the Court hereafter may direct.

If the appointment herein made of a Special Master is not accepted, or if the place becomes vacant during the recess of the Court, the Chief Justice shall have authority to make a new designation, which shall have the same effect as if originally made by the Court herein.

David S. Barry, Sergeant-at-Arms of the United States Senate, et al., Petitioners,
647 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 22, next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
——, Original. Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

It is further ordered that a rule issue to the Honorable William B. Sheppard, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida, to show cause, returnable April 22, 1929, why a writ of mandamus should not issue out of this Court requiring him to revoke the order heretofore made by him on the 8th day of February, 1929, in the case of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, complainant vs. A. S. Wells, E. S. Matthews and Mamie G. Eaton, Railroad Commissioners of the State of Florida, defendants, and to call to his assistance two other Federal Judges, as provided by section 266 of the Judicial Code (Title 28, Section 380 of the United States Code), to hear and determine the said cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ruth Anne Bundy,
Petitioner,
728 vs.
Walter L. Bundy.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered, that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ruth Anne Bundy,
Petitioner,
728 vs.
Walter L. Bundy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Safe Deposit and Trust Company of Baltimore, Maryland,
Appellant,
618 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel. Joseph Wenger,
Appellant,
631 vs.
W. Frank Mathues, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Tin Lun, by next friend, et al., Plaintiffs in error,
74 vs.
W. F. Bond, State Superintendent of Education, H. P. Taylor, H. L. Hitch, et al.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi with directions to the Circuit Court of Coahoma County, Mississippi, to dismiss the petition for mandamus without costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio on the relation of John C. Popovici, Vice Consul of Roumania, Petitioner,
686 vs.
Abram W. Agler, Charles Krichbaum and Edwin W. Diehl, Judges of the Court of Common Pleas of Stark County, Ohio.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wabash Railway Company, Myron J. Hall, H. W. Cohu, et al., Petitioners,
693 vs.
John C. Barclay and Willoughby Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Shirley P. Austin, Petitioner,
694 vs.
John C. Barclay and Willoughby Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

District of Columbia, Petitioner,
723 vs.
Georgiana Thompson.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Corning Distilling Company,

Petitioner,

625 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward P. Goltra,

Petitioner,

661 vs.

Dwight F. Davis, Secretary of War of the United States, Successor of John W. Weeks, Secretary of War of the United States, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anthony Minerich,

Petitioner,

669 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Townsend Estates, Inc., and
Pittsburgh Incinerator Manufacuring Company, Inc., Petitioners,
673 vs.
Kerner Incinerator Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alta Matthews, Administratrix of
Dixon Matthews, deceased,
Petitioner,
677 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Massachusetts Fire & Marine Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
679 vs.
Jake Schneider, Proprietor of Fairfax Department Store.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richmond Hosiery Mills,
Petitioner,
681 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Star Towing and Transportation Company, as owner of Steam tug "Bronx,"
Petitioner,
683 vs.
New Jersey Shipbuilding and Dredging Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris H. Elvidge,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Stelwagon Manufacturing Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Claude C. Sill, Successor of
Edgar Freeman Anderson, as
Receiver of the First National
Bank of Covington,
Petitioner,
vs.
705
William Bell Raiford Pennington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Valve & Meter Company
and Edward E. Johnson,
Petitioners,
vs.
722
Fairbanks, Morse & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Oscar Edvin Ferdinand Persson. 195

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, reversed, and the cause remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the decision of this Court in the case of D. M. McDonald vs. United States, No. 117, October Term, 1928.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, and on motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court in the case of McDonald v. United States.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Marco Nicolich. 196

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, reversed, and the cause remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the decision of this Court in the case of D. M. McDonald v. United States, No. 117, October Term, 1928.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, and on motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court in the case of McDonald v. United States.

The Okanogan, Methow, San Poelis Indian Tribes, etc., Petitioners,
565 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, leave was granted Hatton W. Sumners to file a brief and to participate in the oral argument on behalf of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, as amicus curiae.

J. R. Wheeler, Petitioner,
711 vs.
Howard Greene, Receiver of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Dean G. Acheson in behalf of Mr. Lyman M. Bass and Mr. Porter R. Chandler, leave was granted to file a brief of the Stockholers' Protective Committee of the Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank, as amicus curiae.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of the City of Cape May, Petitioner,
——,Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmond C. Fletcher for the petitioner.

Mae Silver, Appellant,
623 vs.
Benjamin Silver.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. O'Keefe for the appellant.

Anna M. Jensen, Appellant,
634 vs.
Continental Life Insurance Co.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Donnelly for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. W. Calvin Chestnut for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

George Klar,
Appellant,
662 vs.
The Erie Railroad Company and
The Youngstown Equipment
Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Don F. Reed for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. E. A. Foote and Mr. D. B. Holt for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

The United States of America and
The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
663 vs.
Erie Railroad Company and Hoboken
Manufacturers' Railroad Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton, and Mr. Edward M. Reidy for the appellants.

William Roschen,
Appellant,
667 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General,
etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Seligsberg for the appellant.

S. S. Kresge Company,
Appellant,
668 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General,
etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Seligsberg for the appellant.

Vincente G. Sinco, Pilar G. Sinco, assisted by her husband, Jose E. Romero, et al,
Petitioners,
650 vs.
Agapito Longa and Agueda Longa, assisted by her husband, Manuel Tevez.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claro M. Recto for the petitioners.

Edmund G. Chamberlain,
Petitioner,
653 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. Hayden for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
685 vs.
Joseph Egyed.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifton P. Williamson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Morris Cukor for the respondent.

Robert Alexander Blaine, Jr., and Thomas Edwin Culwell, Petitioners,
688 vs.
United States of America.
William Lee Robinson, Petitioner,
689 vs.
United States of America.
Robert Alexander Blaine, Jr., and Thomas Edwin Culwell, Petitioners,
690 vs.
United States of America.
Eugene J. Irvine, Petitioner,
691 vs.
United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jed. C. Adams and Mr. W. B. Harrell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Thomas J. Gerahty, Vincent Gerahty, et al., Petitioners,
692 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Philip Hill for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the respondent.

J. H. Jonas, doing business under name of J. H. Jonas and Son,
Petitioner,
700 vs.
Hill County Cotton Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Cano for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. C. Wear for the respondent.

Southland Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
701 vs.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Cano for the petitioner.

District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
The Riggs National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Bride and Mr. F. H. Stephens for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Hogan and Mr. William H. Donovan for the respondent.

The Okanogan, Methow, San Poelis (or San Poil), Nespelem, Colville, and Lake Indian Tribes or Bands of the State of Washington,
Petitioners,
565 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. William S. Lewis for the petitioners, by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the respondent, and by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners for the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court.

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph H. Case, It is ordered that Herbert Wilson Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Anber Siegal, It is ordered that John B. Boddie, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George J. Feldman, It is ordered that Harold A. J. Oppenheim, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Madison L. Hill, It is ordered that Conway N. Kitchen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Robert B. Hardison, Esquire, of Greenville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Brown, It is ordered that Andrew H. Brown, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, and Francis W. Brown, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lunsford L. Hanner, It is ordered that Frederick E. Younkin, Esquire, of Connellsville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Martin, It is ordered that Ballard M. James, and Joe Hobson, Esquires, of Prestonsburg, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bernard F. Weadock, It is ordered that Jerome Weadock and Arthur Weadock, Esquires, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Craig Peacock, It is ordered that F. Morse Hubbard, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry S. Manley, It is ordered that Wendell P. Brown, Esquire, of Leonardsville, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Amasa M. Holcombe, It is ordered that Ralph Montgomery Arkush, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Trowbridge Forbes, It is ordered that Linwood M. Erskine, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Leo Huslander, It is ordered that Leonard S. Levin, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Compania General De Tabacos De Filipinas, Petitioner, vs. Collector of Internal Revenue. 335

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Edward H. Johnson. 455

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Myrtle J. Johnson. 456

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Isom Grayson, Micey Keys,
Paulina Carolina, et al.,
Petitioners,
116 vs.
James A. Harris, William H.
Harris, James H. Kennedy, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

V. L. Highland,
Petitioner,
8 vs.
Russell Car & Snow Plow Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Harry F. Sinclair,

555 vs.

The United States of America.

On certificate and the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The State of Alabama and Alabama Public Service Commission,

Appellants,

166 vs.

The United States of America, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama for final disposition on the merits.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Arthur J. Karnuth, United States Director of Immigration, and Charles Dreher, Inspector in Charge, United States Immigration Service, Petitioners,
198 vs.
United States of America, on the Petition of Preston M. Albro, an Attorney, for Mary Cook and Antonio Danelon.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

James R. Nelson and Clyde Randolph, Doing Business as Partners Under the Firm Name and Style of Metropolis Ferry Company,
Plaintiffs in error,
296 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky, by Milton Board, Revenue Agent for the State at Large.

In error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the

hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds,

Concurring: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Pampanga Sugar Mills,
Petitioner,
325 vs.
Wenceslao Trinidad, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supeme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

John Martin Riehle, as Receiver in Equity of the Morosco Holding Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
347 vs.
Edward Margolies.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

John F. Gilchrist, Leon G.
Godley, and Charles C. Lockwood,
Constituting the Transit Commission,
etc., et al., Appellants,
159 vs.
Interborough Rapid Transit Company
and Manhattan Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Van Devanter, Mr. Justice Sutherland, and Mr. Justice Butler.

Ithaca Trust Company, Sole
Surviving Executor and Trustee
Under the Last Will and Testament
of Edwin C. Stewart, Deceased,
Petitioner,
267 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States Printing and Lithograph Company, Petitioner, vs. Griggs, Cooper and Company.

372

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

County of Spokane and County of Whitman, Washington, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

164

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carson Petroleum Company,

Petitioner,

306 vs.

Leon C. Vial, Sheriff and Tax Collector of The Parish of St. Charles; R. A. DeBroca, Assessor for the Parish of St. Charles, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

London Guarantee and Accident Company, Ltd., Appellant,

491 vs.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, Sarah Jane Brooke and John Arthur Brooke.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of California for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Sutter Butte Canal Company,

Plaintiff in error,

403 vs.

The Railroad Commission of the State of California.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Severino Alberto,

Petitioner,

364 vs.

Bonifacio Nicolas.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex Parte: In the Matter of City of Cape May.

——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mae Silver,
Appellant,
623 vs.
Benjamin Silver.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and
The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Appellants,
663 vs.
The Erie Railroad Company, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Roschen,
Appellant,
667 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General
of the State of New York, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. H. Kresge Company,
Appellant,
668 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General
of the State of New York,
et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anna M. Jensen,

Appellant,

634 vs.

Continental Life Insurance Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Klar,

Appellant,

662 vs.

The Erie Railroad Company and

The Youngstown Equipment Co.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Klar,

Petitioner,

662 vs.

The Erie Railroad Company and

The Youngstown Equipment Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vincente G. Sinco, Pilar G. Sinco, et al., Petitioners, vs. Agapito Longa and Agueda Longa, assisted by her husband Manuel Tevez.

650 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edmund G. Chamberlain, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

653 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Joseph Egyed.

685 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Alexander Blaine, Jr., and
Thomas Edwin Culwell,
Petitioners,
688 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Lee Robinson,
Petitioner,
689 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Alexander Blaine, Jr., and
Thomas Edwin Culwell,
Petitioners,
690 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eugene J. Irvine,
Petitioner,
691 vs.
United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas J. Gerahty, Vincent Gerahty and Joseph W. Clark,
Petitioners,
692 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. Jonas, doing business under the name of J. H. Jonas and Son,
Petitioner,
700 vs.
Hill County Cotton Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southland Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

701 vs.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

District of Columbia,

Petitioner,

740 vs.

The Riggs National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Johnson,

Petitioner,

220 vs.

United States Shipping Board
Emergency Fleet Corporation.

ORDER

It is ordered that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument and set down for hearing with No. 676, United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation vs. Lustgarten, the two cases to be argued as one. The Court especially invites argument on the following questions:

1. Is the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, as an agency of the United States, immune from suit for the tortious acts of persons whom it has employed to carry on the operation of merchant vessels of the United States, and who have been selected by it with due care?

2. Are the remedies given against the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation by the Suits in Admiralty Act of March 9, 1920, exclusive of all other remedies, whether at law or in admiralty, for liabilities of the Fleet Corporation growing out of the operation of merchant vessels of the United States?

3. Is the two-year period of limitation prescribed in the Suits in Admiralty Act applicable to the present suit?

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Roy O. West, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,

813 vs.

The United States on relation of Emil L. Krushnic.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Acting Solicitor General, suggesting the resignation of Roy O. West, as Secretary of the Interior, and he having moved the Court to substitute Ray Lyman Wilbur, successor in office of Roy O. West, as the party petitioner in this cause,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Verde River Irrigation and Power Company, Petitioner,
174 vs.
Roy O. West, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Acting Solicitor General, suggesting the resignation of Roy O. West, as Secretary of the Interior, and he having moved the Court to substitute Ray Lyman Wilbur, successor in office of Roy O. West, as a party respondent in this cause,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Verde River Irrigation and Power Company, Petitioner,
174 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a brief for the respondents within 20 days from this date, It is now here ordered, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado, Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas and The Finney County Water Users' Association.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file answer of the defendant, The State of Kansas, and of the defendant, Finney County Water Users' Association, It is now here ordered, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works and Director of the Department of Highways and Public Works of the State of Ohio, et al., Appellants,
674 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Company.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works and Director of the Department of Highways and Public Works of the State of Ohio, et al., Appellants,
675 vs.
The Providence Mill Company.

The motions to advance these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Ritter, in behalf of Mr. Gilbert Bettman and Mr. Leroy W. Hunt for the appellants, Suggestion in opposition thereto submitted by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of Mr. U. G. Denman for the appellees.

Joseph H. Bromley
635 vs.
Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. George E. Hamilton, Jr., leave was granted to file a brief of John W. Dyre, Jr., and John M. Perry, as amici curiae.

Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
481 vs.
A. J. A. Alexander.

The death of A. J. A. Alexander, respondent herein, having been suggested, Therefore, on consideration of the motionof Mr. George V. Triplett, to substitute Mrs. Kate Holloway Alexander and Security Trust Company, executors of the estate of A. J. A. Alexander, deceased, as the parties respondents in this cause, pursuant to stipulation between the parties; It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Shoe Company, Petitioner, 718 vs. Federal Trade Commission.	On motion of Mr. J. D. Williamson in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief for the petitioner, on or before Friday next.
The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, as sole surviving executors, etc., Appellant, 632 vs. The State of Minnesota. The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, as sole surviving executor, etc., Appellant, 633 vs. The State of Minnesota.	The statement as to jurisdiction in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Morgan and Mr. Cleon Headley for the appellant.
Superior Oil Company, Appellant, 642 vs. The State of Mississippi ex rel. Rush H. Knox, Attorney General.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Watkins and Mr. W. Lee Guice for the appellant.
Alice Barbee Wick, Appellant, 652 vs. Chelan Electric Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Thomas Balmer and Mr. Charles S. Albert for the appellee, in opposition thereto.
Charles Blind et al., Appellants, and Plaintiffs in error, 682 vs. Philip H. Brockman, as President, etc. et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest F. Oakley, Jr., for the appellants and plaintiffs in error.

W. O. Booher,
Plaintiff in error,
721 vs.
The State of Washington.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the plaintiff in error in this case do show cause, if any cause there be, on or before Monday, April 29, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon, why the above entitled cause should not be dismissed for failure to file a statement as to jurisdiction, as required by paragraph 1 of Rule 12 of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Verde River Irrigation & Power Company, Petitioner,
174 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior and William Spry, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Merillat and Mr. James W. Beller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. E. C. Finney for the respondents.

Andy Vukich,
Petitioner,
695 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence H. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

William E. Culver,
Petitioner,
697 vs.
Wakem and McLaughlin, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis L. Dent and Mr. Warner M. Pomerene for the respondents.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
698 vs.
City National Bank.
The City National Bank,
Petitioner,
741 vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter L. Clark for the petitioner in No. 698 and by Mr. John W. Green, Mr. J. A. Fowler, and Mr. John K. Shields for the petitioner in No. 741 and respondent in No. 698.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
699 vs.
The Bank of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Sheean for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward R. Johnston and Mr. Henry Jackson Darby for the respondent.

Admiral-Oriental Line Inc.,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
The United States of America and
Sidney Blumenthal & Co., Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cletus Keating for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondents.

C. B. Fox Company, Incorporated, Petitioner,
703 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Hoehling, Mr. Earle W. Wallick, and Mr. Ben Jenkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

The Cuyahoga Abstract Title & Trust Company, Petitioner,
704 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. Hoehling, Mr. Earle W. Wallick, and Mr. Ben Jenkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harvey R. Gamble for the respondent.

Louis D. Berkower, Petitioner,
706 vs.
Ben G. Mielziner, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the petitioner.

The Barstow San Antonio Oil Company, Petitioner,
707 vs.
Leon P. Whitney et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Green for the petitioner.

Herbert H. White, Petitioner, 708 vs. Edmund J. Barnard, G. Wallace Tibbetts et al.	Petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roland Gray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lowell A. Mayberry for the respondents.
Reuben Sadowsky, Petitioner, 709 vs. Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eli S. Wolbarst for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Millar E. McGilchrist for the respondent.
William G. Marsh, Petitioner, 710 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving K. Baxter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.
J. R. Wheeler, Petitioner, 711 vs. Howard Greene, Receiver of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Jackson Darby, and Mr. Joseph V. Quarles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin S. Mack and Mr. Arthur W. Fairchild for the respondent.

Emery Olmstead,
Petitioner,
717 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin L. Pipes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

International Shoe Company,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Williamson, Mr. Frank Y. Gladney, and Mr. Charles Nagel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Robert E. Healy, Mr. Adrien F. Busick, and Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd for the respondent.

Walter W. Abell, Elizabeth M. Abell, and Mary Abell Morgan,
Petitioners,
719 vs.
Galen L. Tait, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Miller for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Marks Lewy,
Petitioner,
724 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. Brundage, Mr. Benson Landon, and Mr. Robert N. Holt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney

The United States of America,
on petition of Preston M. Albro
on the relation of John Graber,
Petitioner,
725 vs.
Arthur J. Karnuth, United States
Director of Immigration, et al.

John Graber,
Petitioner,
726 vs.
Arthur J. Karnuth, United States District
Director of Immigration.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Preston M. Albro for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondents.

Rufus Hooks,
Petitioner,
727 vs.
Canadian Holding Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Ledbetter for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. C. Luster, pro se.

Robert L. Tudor,
Petitioner,
729 vs.
John W. Schindler, Receiver of
Consumers Service Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earl B. Barnes and Mr. Conrad Wolf for the petitioner, and by Mr. Asa J. Smith and Mr. Shepard J. Crumpacker for the respondents.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
731 vs.
Cashmere Fruit Growers Union et al.
Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
732 vs.
Cashmere Fruit Growers Union et al.
Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
733 vs.
Cashmere Fruit Growers Union et al.
Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
734 vs.
Cashmere Fuit Growers Union et al.
Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
735 vs.
Wenatchee Federated Growers Inc.,
et al.
Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
736 vs.
Wenatchee Federated Growers Inc.,
Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
737 vs.
F. L. Wood, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Weinberger and Mr. Charles S. Albert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry Elliott, Jr., for the respondents.

The Anglo & London Paris National Bank of San Francisco, Petitioner,
739 vs.
Consolidated National Bank of Tucson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona and/or Superior Court of Pima County, State of Arizona, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert and Mr. Mahlon B. Doing for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel L. Kingan for the respondent.

Samuel Lazzara, Petitioner,
742 vs.
The Wisconsin Boxing Club et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond J. Cannon and Mr. Frank L. Fawcett for the petitioner, and by Mr. George A. Burns for the respondent.

The Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
744 vs.
James Marshall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilfrid E. Rumble for the petitioner, and by Mr. Seth W. Richardson for the respondent.

William Edelstein, Petitioner,
745 vs.
Hon. Henry W. Goddard, United States District Judge, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Burkan for the petitioner, and by Emily C. Holt for the respondent.

Cornelius J. Anderson, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
749 vs.
Pere Marquette Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. McShane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney C. Murray and Mr. Marvin A. Jersild for the respondent.

Jacob S. Meyer,
Petitioner,
750 vs.
A. Bruce Bielaski, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Copal Mintz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Graham Sumner for the respondent.

Lamar Harris and Lamar Harris for the use of Mrs. H. L. Howe,
Petitioners,
751 vs.
North British & Mercantile Insurance Company, Limited.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Erwin and Mr. Lamar C. Rucker for the petitioners, and by Mr. Theodore A. Hammond and Mr. Alex. W. Smith, Jr., for the respondents.

Henry Ford & Son, Inc.,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
Little Falls Fibre Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Whalen and Mr. Charles E. Nichols, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas O'Connor for the respondent.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
753 vs.
J. E. Fouts, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter L. Clark and Mr. James S. Manning for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. C. Awalt and Mr. George P. Barse for the respondent.

The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
755 vs.
T. F. Booker.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Andrews, Mr. W. L. Cook, and Mr. Robert H. Kelley for the petitioners.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
756 vs.
Mrs. Sarah H. Ross, Executrix of the Estate of John W. Ross, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Keeble for the petitioner, and by Mr. John A. Pitts and Mr. K. T. McConnico for the respondents.

Sidney Bruhn,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
The State of Washington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan and Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioner.

Peter W. Rouss,
Petitioner,
758 vs.
Frank K. Bowers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins and Mr. F. C. Nicodemus, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Barham R. Cary, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Transcontinental Oil Company,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
Mid-Kansas Oil and Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Frierson, Mr. Nelson Phillips, and Mr. J. C. Adams for the petitioner.

R. K. Davidson, Millie Davidson et al., etc., Petitioners,
761 vs.
Flood Bros. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Hasket Derby for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis T. Hengstler and Mr. Frederick W. Dorr for the respondents.

Carl H. Kothe,
Petitioner,
762 vs.
R. C. Taylor Trust.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Pardee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas Hovey Gage for the respondent.

Insurance Company of North America, Petitioner,
765 vs.
Fourth National Bank of Atlanta.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. A. Hammond and Mr. John M. Slaton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hoke Smith and Mr. Marion Smith for the respondent.

T. L. Carpenter and Lillie V. Carpenter, Petitioners,
766 vs.
A. S. J. Shaw, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Moore for the petitioner.

John B. Fergus, Petitioner,
767 vs.
Garrett Kinney, Treasurer of the State of Illinois.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray E. Lane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. Albert D. Rodenberg for the respondent.

B. Geren, Petitioner,
768 vs.
J. S. Cecil.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. McPerren for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas H. Owen and Mr. M. A. Looney for the respondent.

Gulf, Mobile & Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
772 vs.
Ruby Highnote Williams, as Administratrix of the Estate of Walter Williams, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Flowers and Mr. J. C. Hamilton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gregory L. Smith and Mr. Harry H. Smith for the respondent.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner,
779 vs.
Augustus Mackenzie, Jr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. D. P. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. William F. Purdy for the respondent.

Interstate Commerce Commission, Petitioner,
782 vs.
United States of America at the realtion of City of Los Angeles.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the petitioner.

John A. McKay, Appellant,
322 vs.
Hector McInnes, Stuart Jenks, et al.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Quirk, Mr. George F. Graham, and Mr. Ralph B. Fleharty for the appellant, and by Mr. Carroll S. Chaplin for the appellees.

Raul Rógerio Gonzalez, by his Guardian ad litem Leon Gonzalez,
Petitioner,

226 vs.

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 10 o'clock

TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wemell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran, It is ordered that John B. Brady, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Wiener, It is ordered that Albert H. Robbins, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Smith, It is ordered that Thomas Edmunds Turpin, Robert Irving Dennison, William J. Jacobi, and William E. Beck, Jr., Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod, It is ordered that John J. Grealis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson, It is ordered that Sidney C. Mize, Esquire, of Gulfport, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Maddox, It is ordered that Richard M. Thomas, Esquire, of Jamaica, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The People of the State of New York,
Appellants,
601 vs.
Gamble Latrobe, Jr., and James P. Knowles, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw the appearance of Fred F.Greenway, as counsel for the appellees, in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raul Rogerio Gonzalez, by his Guardian ad litem, etc.,.
Petitioner,
226 vs.
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the petitioner, and by Mr. William D. Guthrie for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury for the petitioner.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
133 vs.
Tobe Stapleton, by his statutory guardian, Marion Stapleton.

This case was reargued by Mr. LeWright Browning for the petitioner, and by Mr. George B. Martin for the respondant.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
225 vs.
Marcella Driggers, as Administratrix etc.

The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lloyd F. Loux, It is ordered that Edwin A. Berger, Paul M. Niebell, and Harvey E. Kauffman, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin C. Parks, It is ordered that Aver L. Hirsch, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. Wilson, It is ordered that Andrew M. Henderson, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred L. Geiger, It is ordered that Theodore T. Golden, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

O R D E R

It is ordered, that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the circuits, agreeably to the acts of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.

For the Second Circuit, Harlan Fiske Stone, Associate Justice.

For the Third Circuit, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Associate Justice.

For the Fourth Circuit, William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

For the Fifth Circuit, Edward T. Sanford, Associate Justice.

For the Sixth Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.

For the Seventh Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.

For the Eighth Circuit, Pierce Butler, Associate Justice.

For the Ninth Circuit, George Sutherland, Associate Justice.

For the Tenth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company
Petitioner,
225 vs.
Marcella Driggers, as Administratrix, etc.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner, by Mr. Louis M. Shimel for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner.

The People of the State of New York, Appellants,
601 vs.
Gamble Latrobe, Jr., James P. Knowles, et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. W. B. Brown for the appellants, and by Mr. Ralph Montgomery Arkush for the appellees.

William Roschen, Appellant,
667 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General etc.
S. S. Kresge Company, Appellant,
668 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General, etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Walter M. Seligsberg for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
363 vs.
Alfred Klesner, doing business under the name "Shade Shop", Hooper & Klesner.

This case was argued by Mr. Adrian F. Busick for the petitioner, and submitted by Mr. Clarence R. Ahalt for the respondent.

The United States of America, ex rel. Niels Peter Claussen, Petitioner,
416 vs.
Hon. Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration.

This case was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent, and submitted by Mr. Silas B. Axtell and Mr. Charles A. Ellis for the petitioner.

The United States,

Petitioner,

440 vs.

The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Bates for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, It is ordered that Harrison B. McGraw, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Clifford J. MacMillan, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Peckham, It is ordered that Michael F. Mulcahy, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., et al.,

Appellants,

466 vs.

The United States of America,

This case was argued by Mr. R. S. Outlaw for the appellants; by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellee, The Interstate Commerce Commission; and by Mr. Frank H. Towner for the appellees, The Kansas City Southern Railway Co., et al.

Ex Parte: Worcester County National Bank of Worcester,

Appellant.

469

This case was argued by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the appellant, and by Mr. F. Delano Putnam for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by special leave of Court.

Hugh W. Grant, Receiver of the Struthers Furnace Co.,

Petitioner,

479 vs.

A. B. Leach & Co., Inc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James P. Wilson for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Edward R. Johnston for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson, It is ordered that Byron Richard Cisco, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Laurence Graves, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jo. V. Morgan, It is ordered that C. Erskine Daniel, Esquire, of Spartanburg, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Anthony A. Slakis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Reuben M. Ellerd, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Hugh W. Grant, Receiver of the Struthers Furnace Co., Petitioner,
479 vs.
A. B. Leach & Co. Inc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Edward R. Johnston for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. A. M. Henderson for the petitioner.

Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky, Petitioner,
481 vs.
Mrs. Kate Halloway Alexander et al.

This case was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Elwood Hamilton for the respondents.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
482 vs.
J. Harry Wiener.
C. F. Koutzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
483 vs.
J. Harry Wiener.

These cases were argued by Mr. T. H. Lewis, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward W. Browne and Mr. James S. Y. Ivins for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
Rosika Schwimmer.

This case was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mrs. Olive H. Rabe for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 15, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis. Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Lillian Bass Byers, of Salem, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond J. Mawhinney, It is ordered that Frank Henry Renaud, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson, It is ordered that Edward C. Higgins, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman L. Ekern, It is ordered that Herbert H. Naujoks, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan H. Beach, It is ordered that William D. Harkins, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, It is ordered that Tracy S. Voorhees, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Aaron A. B. Chatters. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

414

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Southern Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
415 vs.
Aaron A. B. Chatters.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works and Director of the Department of Highways, etc., et al., Appellants,
674 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 22 next, at the foot of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works and Director of the Department of Highways, etc., et al., Appellants,
675 vs.
The Providence Mill Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 22nd, next, at the foot of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, as Sole Surviving Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Henry R. Taylor, Deceased,

Appellant,

632 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Farmers Loan & Trust Company, as sole surviving executor of the last will and testament of Henry R. Taylor, deceased,

Appellant,

633 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Superior Oil Company,

Appellant,

642 vs.

The State of Mississippi ex rel. Rush H. Knox, Attorney General.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alice Barbee Wick,

Appellant,

652 vs.

Chelan Electric Company.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Blind, William F. Peikert, et al., Appellants and Plaintiffs in error,

682 vs.

Phillip H. Brockman, as President of the Board of Police Commissioners, etc., et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, The Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John A. McKay,

Appellant,

322 vs.

Hector McInnes, Stuart Jenks, L. A. Lovett, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. R. Wheeler,

Petitioner,

711 vs.

Howard Greene, Receiver of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ; and that the case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 7th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Anglo & London Paris National Bank of San Francisco,

Petitioner,

739 vs.

Consolidated National Bank of Tucson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona and/or Superior Court of Pima County is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Ford & Son, Inc.,

Petitioner,

752 vs.

Little Falls Fibre Company, Asbestos Spinning & Weaving Corporation and Harry A. Furman, et al., etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carl H. Kothe,
Petitioner,
762 vs.
R. C. Taylor Trust.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

T. L. Carpenter and Lillie V. Carpenter, Petitioners,
766 vs.
A. S. J. Shaw, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gulf, Mobile & Northern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
772 vs.
Ruby Highnote Williams, as Administratrix of the Estate of Walter Williams, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Petitioner,
782 vs.
United States of America, at the Relation of City of Los Angeles.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andy Vukich,
Petitioner,
695 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William E. Culver,
Petitioner,
697 vs.
Wakem and McLaughlin, Inc., B. Budweiser and J. Wallace Wakem.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
698 vs.
City National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City National Bank,
Petitioner,
741 vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
699 vs.
The Bank of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Admiral-Oriental Line, Inc.,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
The United States of America and
Sidney Blumenthal & Co., Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. B. Fox Company, Incorporated,
Petitioner,
703 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Cuyahoga Abstract Title and
Trust Company, Petitioner,
704 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis D. Berkower,
Petitioner,
706 vs.
Ben G. Mielziner, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Barstow San Antonio Oil Company, Petitioner,
707 vs.
Leon P. Whitney, The Fullers Earth Company of America, The Dover Oil Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Herbert H. White,
Petitioner,
708 vs.
Edmund J. Barnard, G. Wallace Tibbetts and Lowell A. Mayberry.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reuben Sadowsky,

Petitioner,

709 vs.

Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, andof the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William C. Marsh,

Petitioner,

710 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emery Olmstead,

Petitioner,

717 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Shoe Company,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter W. Abell, Elizabeth M. Abell and Mary Abell Morgan,
Petitioners,
719 vs.
Galen L. Tait, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marks Lewy,
Petitioner,
724 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
on petition of Preston M. Albro,
on the relation of John Graber,

Petitioner,

725 vs.

Arthur J. Karnuth, United States Director of Immigration, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Graber,

Petitioner,

726 vs.

Arthur J. Karnuth, United States District Director of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rufus Hooks,

Petitioner,

727 vs.

Canadian Holding Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Robert L. Tudor,

Petitioner,

729 vs.

John W. Schindler, Receiver of Consumers Service Company, Consumers Service Company, John W. Schindler, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

731 vs.

Cashmere Fruit Growers Union and Gwin, White & Prince, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

732 vs.

Cashmere Fruit Growers Union and Gwin, White & Prince, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

733 vs.

Cashmere Fruit Growers Union and Gwin, White & Prince, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

734 vs.

Cashmere Fruit Growers Union and Gwin, White & Prince, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

735 vs.

Wenatchee Federated Growers, Inc., and Gwin, White & Prince, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

736 vs.

Wenatchee Federated Growers, Inc. and Gwin, White & Prince, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

737 vs.

W. L. Wood and Gwin, White & Prince, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel Lazzara,

Petitioner,

742 vs.

The Wisconsin Boxing Club, The Milwaukee Aerie No. 137, Fraternal Order of Eagles.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
744 vs.
James Marshall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Edelstein, Petitioner,
745 vs.
Hon. Henry W. Goddard, United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornelius J. Anderson, as Administrator of the Estate of Mary Anderson, deceased, Petitioner,
749 vs.
Pere Marquette Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob S. Meyer,

Petitioner,

750 vs.

A. Bruce Bielaski, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lamar Harris and Lamar Harris for the use of Mrs. H. L. Rowe,

Petitioners,

751 vs.

North British & Mercantile Insurance Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maryland Casualty Company,

Petitioner,

753 vs.

J. E. Fouts, Receiver of Peoples National Bank of Salisbury, North Carolina.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railway Company and Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland,
Petitioners,
755 vs.
T. F. Booker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
756 vs.
Mrs. Sarah H. Ross, Executrix of the Estate of John W. Ross, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sidney Brunn,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
The State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter W. Rouss,
Petitioner,
758 vs.
Frank K. Bowers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Transcontinental Oil Company,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
Mid-Kansas Oil and Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. K. Davidson, Millie Davidson and Leon Strauss, doing business under the name of Davidson & Strauss, Petitioner,
761 vs.
Flood Bros., George Flood and James Flood, and Carriso, Inc., claimant of the American Motorship "Carriso," her tackle, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Insurance Company of North America, Petitioner,
765 vs.
Fourth National Bank of Atlanta.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John B. Fergus,
Petitioner,
767 vs.
Garrett Kinney, Treasurer of the State of Illinois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
779 vs.
Augustus Mackenzie, Jr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
407 vs.
Old Colony Railroad.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, of counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ithaca Trust Company, etc.,
Petitioner,
267 vs.
The United States .

On motion of Mr. Simon Lyon for the petition, the mandate was granted in this case.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13, Original vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion to cite The Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers, United States Army, as parties defendant, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest L. Averill for the complainant in support thereof, and by Mr. Bentley W. Warren for the defendant in opposition thereto.

State of Wisconsin et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago.

State of New York,
Complainant,

The motion of the City of Chicago for leave to intervene as a party defendant herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson in support of the motion, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the complainant, The State of New York, and Mr. Herman L. Ekern for the complainant, The State of Wisconsin, in opposition thereto.

Old Colony Trust Company, et al., executors,
130 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Leave granted to file brief of W. A. Sutherland, as amicus curiae, on motion of Mr. W. A. Sutherland in that behalf. Motion to participate in the oral argument denied.

Crooker Perry and Leonore Perry, His Wife, Appellants,
754 vs.
Chelan Electric Company, and Chelan County, Washington.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the appellants in this case do show cause, if any cause there be, on or before Monday, May 13, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon, why the above entitled cause should not be dismissed for failure to file a statement as to jurisdiction within the time fixed by Paragraph 1 of Rule 12 of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hardwick Realty Company, Inc., Petitioner,
795 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
674 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Co.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works etc., et al.,
Appellants,
675 vs.
The Providence Mill Company.

The statements as to jurisdiction herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gilbert Bettman, Mr. Leroy W. Hunt, and Mr. George W. Ritter for the appellants.

The Corn Exchange Bank,
Appellant,
687 vs.
Bird S. Coler, Commissioner of Public Welfare of the City of New York.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Spotswood D. Bowers for the appellant.

Greenway Apartment Company,
Appellant,
713 vs.
The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Maryland, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Isaac Lobe Strauss for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Charles F. Harley and Mr. Burdette B. Webster for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Louis J. Tyson,
Appellant,
714 vs.
Roland H. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, et al., etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Mannix for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. John H. Dunbar for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Louisiana Greyhound Club, Inc.,
Appellant,
720 vs.
Frank J. Clancy, Sheriff, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the appellant.

Tagg Bros. & Moorhead, Richard M. Laverty, et al.,
Appellants,
738 vs.
The United States of America, William M. Jardine, as Secretary of Agriculture, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck, Mr. Francis A. Brogan, Mr. Anan Raymond, and Mr. Alfred G. Ellick for the appellants.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
763 vs.
Department of Public Works of Washington and Campbell River Mills Company, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Dudley and Mr. O. W. Dynes for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Dunbar, Mr. H. C. Brodie, and Mr. S. J. Wettrick for the respondent.

The Prudential Insurance Company of America, petitioner,
769 vs.
Stephen Baciocco.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Eldred Boland for the petitioner.

Thomas F. Reilly, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
770 vs.
Morris Messinger, Trading as Diener & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel C. Duberstein for the petitioner.

Lesser-Goldman Cotton Company, Petitioner,
771 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas J. Railey for the respondent.

Tidal Osage Oil Company, Petitioner,
774 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wallace C. Franklin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. E. C. Finney, and Mr. Pedro Capo-Rodriquez for the respondent.

Loft, Inc.,
Petitioner,
775 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. S. Gilbert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
776 vs.
W. J. Howard.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. J. Howard for the respondent.

William Woodman,
Petitioner,
777 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. E. Kahn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the respondent.

S. D. Russell,
Petitioner,
780 vs.
James A. Holt, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Wills for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert S. Bozeman for the respondents.

Bartlesville Zinc Company,
Petitioner,
789 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry C. Barnes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton and Mr. E. M. Reidy for the respondent.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
796 vs.
H. F. Keddy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert O. Brennan, Mr. E. E. McInnis, and Mr. Edgar W. Camp for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. F. Keddy pro se.

Magnolia Gas Company,
Plaintiff in error and appellant,
148 vs.
Graves Leeper, as Secretary of State of the State of Oklahoma.

In error to and appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation to dismiss the writ of error and appeal in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the writ of error and appeal in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America

129 vs.

Boston and Maine Railroad.

Old Colony Trust Company et al.,

executors,

130 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

These causes were reargued by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine for the Old Colony Trust Company et al., executors, and by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Charles L. Douglas,

Petitioner,

312 vs.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner; continued by Mr. E. R. Brumley for the respondent; by Mr. Hamilton Ward as Attorney General of the State of New York, amicus curiae, by special leave of Court; and by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Heintzman, It is ordered that Wm. E. Hess, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. E. Evans, It is ordered that Lewis B. Randall, Esquire, of Pasadena, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Samuel T. Bush, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene B. Sullivan, It is ordered that Albert A. Griffin, Esquire, of Bradford, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Wisconsin et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary
District of Chicago.
State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original, vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary
District of Chicago.
State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
State of Illinois and Sanitary
District of Chicago.

On motion of Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson in that behalf, leave was granted to file suggestions by the City of Chicago in reply to brief in opposition to motion of the City of Chicago for leave to intervene as a party defendant in this cause.

Charles L. Douglas,
Petitioner,
312 vs.
The New York, New Haven and
Hartford Railroad Company.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Hamilton Ward, as Attorney General of the State of New York, amicus curiae, by special leave of Court.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
California Cooperative Canneries.

This case was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson for the respondent.

Atlanta and Charlotte Air Line Railway Company, et al., Petitioner,
495 vs.
R. F. Green.

This case was argued by Mr. Sidney R. Prince for the petitioners, and by Mr. C. Erskine Daniel for the respondent.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
501 vs.
Concrete Mixing & Conveying Co.
Concrete Mixing & Conveying Co., Petitioner,
528 vs.
R. C. Storrie & Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John D. Morgan for the petitioners in No. 501; continued by Mr. Alan M. Johnson for the petitioners, in No. 501; by Mr. Stephen J. Cox for the respondant in No. 501; and by Mr. Lynn A. Williams for the petitioner in No. 528.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Richardson, It is ordered that R. D. FitzGibbon, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, It is ordered that Guy M. Wilson, Esquire, of Flint, State of Michigan, and John P. Colden, Esquire, of Pontiac, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Porter, It is ordered that Casper Schenk, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter L. Clark, It is ordered that Roszel C. Thomsen, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that William B. Crawford, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. August H. Andresen, It is ordered that Chester S. Wilson, Esquire, of Stillwater, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., It is ordered that Frank E. Liverance, Jr., Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
501 vs.
Concrete Mixing & Conveying Co.
Concrete Mixing & Conveying Co., Petitioner,
528 vs.
R. C. Storrie & Co.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Lynn A. Williams for the petitioner in No. 528, and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Townsend for the respondent in No. 528.

Gulf Refining Co., Petitioner,
506 vs.
Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Ira A. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. R. Lyeth for the respondent.

Western & Atlantic R. R.,
Appellant,
519 vs.
Mrs. Mary E. Henderson and Maryland
Casualty Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the appellant, and by Mr. Reuben R. Arnold for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards, It is ordered that Floyd Martin Sheffield, and Charles S. Rosenwchein, Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Hall, It is ordered that Marcien Jenckes, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. B. M. Parmenter, It is ordered that Harry R. Lawrence, Esquire, of Lawrence, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Gibson, It is ordered that James B. Estee, Esquire, of Montpelier, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Pacific Co.,
Petitioner,
699 vs.
The Bank of America.

The motion to withold the issuance of the order denying the petition for writ of certiorari in this case was denied.

Indian Motocycle Company,
576 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. James S. Y. Ivins in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of James S. Y. Ivins, Kingman Brewster, Joseph D. Brady, and O. R. Folsom-Jones, as amici curiae.

Maryland Casualty Co.,
Petitioner,
524 vs.
Millie R. Jones.

This case was argued by Mr. Roszel C. Thomsen and Mr. Walter L. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nat Schmulowitz for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
526 vs.
The John Barth Company and U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

This case was argued by Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Quarles and Mr. Walter H. Moses for the respondents.

Geo. B. Williams et al.,
Appellants,
529 vs.
Ray L. Riley, As State Controller of the State of California.

This case was argued by Mr. F. L. Guerina for the appellee, and submitted by Mr. Edwin C. Ewing, and Mr. W. R. Crawford for the appellants.

Bekins Van Line, Inc., et al.,
Appellants,
530 vs.
Ray L. Riley, as State Controller of the State of California.

This case was argued by Mr. Samuel T. Bush for the appellants, and by Mr. F. L. Guerena for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 19, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Francis M. Curlee, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, and U. Bon Geaslin, Esquire, of Kennett, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Alvord, It is ordered that George Prew Savoy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold B. Teegarden, It is ordered that Glenn C. Minter, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Central New England Railway Company, Petitioner,
532 vs.
Boston & Albany R. R. Co., Assignor for the Benefit of New York Central R. R. Co., Assignee.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John L. Hall for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Standard Oil Company & Sinclair Refining Co., Petitioners,
545 vs.
City of Marysville, L. N. Cole, as Mayor, et al., etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Earl W. Evans and Mr. Thomas F. Doran for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edgar C. Bennett and Mr. H. W. Colmery for the respondents.

Alexander F. Winters and Basil R. Crampton, Petitioners,
547 vs.
Dent Hardware Company.
Sanitary Refrigerator Company, Petitioner,
128 vs.
Alexander F. Winters and Basil R. Crampton.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frank E. Liverance, Jr., for Alexander F. Winters, et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin M. Golder, It is ordered that Joseph Moss, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl Fenning, It is ordered that William Sherman Greene, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, and John T. Scott, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred Lucking, It is ordered that Dean Lucking, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ruby R. Vale, It is ordered that Maxwell Pestcoe, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. D. McKenney, It is ordered that Frederick D. McCarthy, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Hoover, it is ordered that Martin W. Littleton, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Douglas, It is ordered that Edmund D. Campbell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker, It is ordered that Daniel B. Strickler, Esquire, of Lancaster, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip D. Swing, It is ordered that Frank Tate, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that Carl R. Landrum, Esquire, of Mountain View, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner, vs. Warner, Barnes & Co., Ltd.

251

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner, vs. J. M. Menzi.

252

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Harry H. Weiss, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. J. Harry Wiener.

482

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the judgment of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

C. F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. J. Harry Wiener.

483

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the judgment of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William Roschen,

Appellant,

667 vs.

Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York; Joab H. Banton, District Attorney of New York County, New York, and Williston W. Bissell, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

S. S. Kresge Company,

Appellant,

668 vs.

Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York; Joab H. Banton, District Attorney of New York County, New York, and Williston W. Bissell, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion to cite the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers of the United States Army as parties defendant in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Wisconsin, et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.
The State of Michigan,
Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.
The State of New York,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.

On consideration of the motion of the City of Chicago for leave to intervene in these causes, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works, etc., of the State of Ohio, et al.,
Appellants,
674 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Company.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works, etc., of the State of Ohio, et al.,
Appellants,
675 vs.
The Providence Mill Company.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Corn Exchange Bank,
Appellant,
687 vs.
Bird S. Coler, Commissioner of Public Welfare of the City of New York.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tagg Bros. & Moorhead, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
738 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis J. Tyson,
Appellant,
714 vs.
Roland H. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, et al.

On consideration of the statements as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown, and the case is placed upon the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana Greyhound Club, Inc., Appellant,
720 vs.
Frank J. Clancy, Sheriff of the Parish of Jefferson, etc., et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown, and the case is placed upon the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Greenway Apartment Company, Appellant,
713 vs.
The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Maryland, et al.

It is now here ordered that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction in this case be postponed to the hearing on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlanta and Charlotte Air Line Railway Company and Southern Railway Company, Petitioners,
495 vs.
R. F. Green,

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the cause be and the remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
776 vs.
W. J. Howard.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Verde River Irrigation & Power Company, Petitioner,
174 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior and William Spry, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
763 vs.
Department of Public Works of Washington and Campbell River Mills Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

The Prudential Insurance Company of America, Petitioner,
769 vs.
Stephen Baciocco.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas F. Reilly, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Morris Messinger, Trading as Diener & Co., Petitioner,
770 vs.
Morris Messinger, Trading as Diener & Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lesser-Goldman Cotton Company,
Petitioner,
771 vs.
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tidal Osage Oil Company,
Petitioner,
774 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Loft, Inc.,
Petitioner,
775 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

William Woodman,
Petitioner,
777 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. D. Russell,
Petitioner,
780 vs.
James A. Holt, Administrator of the Estate of Henry Walker, deceased and Stella Frances Walker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bartlesville Zinc Company,
Petitioner,
789 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
796 vs.
H. F. Keddy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

O R D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court that the call of the docket be suspended for the term on Friday, April 26 next, and that the Court will take a recess from Monday, April 29, until Monday, May 13 next.

No petitions for writs of certiorari or other motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, May 27 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft,

The Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
712 vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. John W. Townsend in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of The Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company of California, as amicus curiae.

Newell B. Wallace, Petitioner,
261 vs.
Motor Products Corporation et al.

The motion for leave to file a counter-showing to the supplemental returns from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals or, if denied, then to strike returns from the files, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred Lucking for the petitioner.

The Railroad Commission of the State of California and The City of Los Angeles, Appellants, 801 vs. Los Angeles Railway Corporation.	The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton in behalf of counsel.
The Macallen Company, Appellant, 578 vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.	On motion of Mr. Seth T. Cole in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Seth T. Cole, as amicus curiae.
Ex Parte: Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, 19, Original .	The return of Honorable William B. Sheppard, United States District Judge, to the Rule to Show Cause was presented to the Court.
William Caine Davidson, Petitioner, 843 vs. The People of the State of California.	The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Caine Davidson pro se.
A. W. Wilson, Appellant, 715 vs. F. B. McFarland, Sheriff, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. A. Bonham for the appellant.
Robert Harvie, doing business under the name and style of Automatic Sales Company, Appellant, 716 vs. T. A. Heise, Sheriff, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. A. Bonham for the appellant.

The Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
712 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. R. Serven and Mr. John G. Carter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Lisle A. Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. E. H. Horton for the respondent.

The Former Corporation, (formerly Philipsborn's), Petitioner,
730 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence N. Goodwin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. John E. Hoover for the respondent.

Luckenbach Steamship Company, Petitioner,
764 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King, Mr. William B. King, and Mr. George R. Shields for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

Queenie V. Carter and Burl Carter et al., Petitioners,
778 vs.
J. C. Luster, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. E. Disney for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. C. Luster pro se.

James E. Lacroix,
Petitioner,
784 vs.
Louise A. J. Rivard, et al.
James E. Lacroix,
Petitioner,
785 vs.
Louise A. J. Rivard, et al.
James E. Lacroix,
Petitioner,
786 vs.
Henry J. Lacroix.
James E. Lacroix,
Petitioner,
787 vs.
Elmira Deziel.
James E. Lacroix,
Petitioner,
788 vs.
Louis A. Deziel et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Look and Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred Lucking, Mr. William Lucking, and Mr. Thomas G. Long for the respondents.

Mrs. Thomas H. Watson, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
790 vs.
Georgia Southern and Florida Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court, by Mr. Jno. R. L. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. John E. Hall for the respondents.

Federal Sugar Refining Company,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the

State of North Carolina, through Dennis G. Brummitt, etc., Petitioner,
798 vs.
Southern Railway Company and Atlantic and Yadkin Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Aubrey L. Brooks and Mr. Dennis G. Brummitt for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. C. H. Hastings, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the respondents.

Mabel G. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
799 vs.
Eudora Hull Spalding.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. T. H. Lewis, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Zane and Mr. Alfred T. Carton for the respondent.

Harry Schnell et al., Petitioners,
802 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Joffe for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Peoples Bank of Keyser, West Virginia, Petitioner,
804 vs.
International Finance Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Garnett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugh H. Obear for the respondent.

The American Tobacco Company,
Petitioner,
812 vs.
Porto Rican American Tobacco Company of Porto Rico.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin Conboy and Mr. Jonathan H. Holmes for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Lewis Brown for the respondent.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of New Jersey,
Petitioner,
815 vs.
Plainfield-Union Water Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John O. Bigelow for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank Bergen for the respondent.

Alexander F. Winters and Basil R. Crampton, Petitioners,
547 vs.
Dent Hardware Company.
Sanitary Refrigerator Co.,
Petitioner,
128 vs.
Alexander F. Winters and Basil R. Crampton.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. E. Hayward Fairbanks for the Dent Hardware Company and Sanitary Refrigerator Company, and concluded by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., for Alexander F. Winters et al.

Harry F. Sinclair et al.,
748 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George P. Hoover for Harry F. Sinclair; submitted on brief by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright and Mr. Philip Ershler for William Mason Day; argument continued by Mr. Charles A. Douglas for William J. Burns et al., and by Mr. Owen J. Robert for the United States.

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Cout in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that James C. Leaton, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Harry F. Sinclair et al.
748 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the United States, and concluded by Mr. Martin W. Littleton for Harry F. Sinclair.

David S. Barry, Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate et al., Petitioners,
647 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

This case was argued by Mr. George W. Wickersham for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ruby R. Vale for the respondent.

Newell B. Wallace,

Petitioner,

261 vs.

Motor Products Corporation et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Alfred Lucking for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond S. Norris, It is ordered that George O'Dougherty, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New Yor, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lloyd F. Loux, It is ordered that Ernest H. Oliver, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Magrady, It is ordered that Alphonse C. F. Kenouski, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy A. Thompson, It is ordered that Lieutellus Cunningham, Esquire, of Bolwar, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

International Shoe Company,
Appellant,
579 vs.
Stratton Shartel, Attorney General of the State of Missouri et al.

On motion of Mr. Lieutellus Cunningham in that behalf, leave was granted Mr. W. E. Sloat to appear and present oral argument, pro hac vice, for the appellees.

Newell B. Wallace,
Petitioner,
261 vs.
Motor Products Corporation, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Alfred Lucking for the petitioner.

Edward Becher,
Petitioner,
559 vs.
Contoure Laboratories, Inc., and Herbert Oppenheimer.

This case was argued by Mr. Floyd M. Sheffield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Rosenschein for the respondents.

Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al.,
Appellants,
563 vs.
United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co., et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morris C. Roberts, Mr. Henry H. Larimore, and Mr. Charles S. Burg for the appellees.

Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
563 vs.
United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the appellants, and by Mr. Charles S. Burg and Mr. Henry H. Larimore for the appellees.

St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co., Appellant,
568 vs.
Alabama Public Service Commission et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Forney Johnston for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Schweinhaut, It is ordered that Alexander R. Troxell, Esquire, of Columbia, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Ritter, It is ordered that Dudley F. Smith, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leroy W. Hunt, It is ordered that Herman A. Krueger, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Appellant,
568 vs.
Alabama Public Service Commission et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Forney Johnston for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. J. Q. Smith for the appellees.

Wheeler Lumber Bridge and Supply Company of Des Moines, Iowa,
571 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Jesse I. Miller for Wheeler Lumber Bridge and Supply Co. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Indian Motocycle Company,
576 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Monte Appel for the Indian Motocycle Company. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Macallen Company, Appellant,
578 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion of Mr. Thomas Allen in that behalf, the appearance of Mr. Richard H. Wiswall, as counsel for the appellant in this case was withdrawn. This case was argued by Mr. Thomas Allen for the appellant, and by Mr. R. Ammi Cutter for the appellee.

International Shoe Company, Appellant,
579 vs.
Stratton Shartel, Attorney General of the State of Missouri, et al.

On motion of Mr. Guy A. Thompson in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of John F. Green, as amicus curiae.

International Shoe Company,
Appellant,
579 vs.
Stratton Shartel, Attorney General
of the State of Missouri, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Guy A. Thompson and Mr. James D. Williamson for the appellant, and by Mr. William E. Sloat for the appellees, pro hac vice, by special leave of Court.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of
Public Works, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
674 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Co.
Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of
Public Works, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
675 vs.
The Providence Mill Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. George W. Ritter for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. S. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Willis Bacon, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Edelin, It is ordered that Simon N. Gazan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that Wilbur J. Hollenne, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. D. McKenney, It is ordered that Edward R. Meyer, Esquire, of Zanesville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that Dudley Field Malone, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clark Burdick, It is ordered that Emmett James Peterson, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Blaine, It is ordered that Joseph A. Padway, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works etc., et al.,
Appellants,
674 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Co.
Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
675 vs.
The Providence Mill Co.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. George W. Ritter for the appellants; continued by Mr. U. G. Denman for the appellee in No. 674; by Mr. Karl E. Burr for the appellee in No. 675; and concluded by Mr. Gilbert Bettman for the appellants. Leave was granted the appellants to file a brief within five days, with leave to appellees to reply thereto within five days thereafter.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that Arthur L. Quinn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph P. Shoup, It is ordered that E. H. Campbell, Esquire, of Battle Creek, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph P. Shoup, It is ordered that Oliver Potter Bennett, Esquire, of Mapleton, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, It is ordered that Murray Corrington, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that Steve Carrigan, Esquire, of Hope, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Donnally, It is ordered that Grant E. Halderman, Esquire, of Boulder, State of Colorado, and George C. Hoover, Esquire, of West Branch, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Newell B. Wallace,
Petitioner,
261 vs.
Motor Products Corporation, et al.

It is now here ordered that further consideration of the motion for leave to file counter-showing to supplemental returns from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, or to strike from the files, be postponed for disposition upon the decision of the case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Railroad Commission of the State of California and the City of Los Angeles,
Appellants,
801 vs.
Los Angeles Railway Corporation.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 21st, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tagg Bros. & Moorhead, et al., etc., Appellants,
738 vs.
The United States of America.

It is ordered that this case be advanced and assigned for argument On Monday, October 7th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Caine Davidson, Petitioner,
843 vs.
The People of the State of California.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Caine Davidson, Petitioner,
843 vs.
The People of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, 19, Original.

It is now here ordered that opportunity be given to the petitioner to show cause, returnable on Monday, May 13, 1929, why the suggestion of the respondent, that the petition in this cause be, dismissed for the reason that the case has become moot, should not be adopted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. W. Wilson,
Appellant,
715 vs.
F. B. McLane, Sheriff of Abbeville County; Chief of Police of City of Abbeville; Nollie Robinson, Sheriff of Aiken County, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert Harvie, doing business under the name and style of Automatic Sales Company,
Appellant,
716 vs.
T. A. Heise, Sheriff for Richland County, John W. Richardson, Chief Constable, B. B. Lightsey, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Luckenbach Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
764 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Sugar Refining Company,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mabel G. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois,
Petitioner,
799 vs.
Eudora Hull Spalding.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Minnesota Mutual Life
Insurance Company (a Corporation),
Petitioner,
712 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Former Corporation (formerly Philipsborn's),
Petitioner,
730 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Queenie V. Carter and Burl
Carter, a Minor, by Queenie V.
Carter, his Guardian,
Petitioners,
778 vs.
J. C. Luster, J. E. Morris and
Canadian Holding Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Lacroix,

Petitioner,

784 vs.

Louise A. J. Rivard, Ernstine Hope and Elmira Deziel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Lacroix,

Petitioner,

785 vs.

Louise A. J. Rivard, Ernstine Hope, and Ann Hambright.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Lacroix,

Petitioner,

786 vs.

Henry J. Lacroix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Lacroix,
Petitioner,
787 vs.
Elmira Deziel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Lacroix,
Petitioner,
788 vs.
Louis A. Deziel and William Lucking.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Thomas H. Watson, as Administratrix of the Estate of Thomas E. Watson, deceased,
Petitioner,
790 vs.
Georgia Southern and Florida Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of North Carolina, through Dennis G. Brummitt, its duly qualified and acting Attorney General, Petitioner,
798. vs.
Southern Railway Company and Atlantic and Yadkin Railway Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry Schnell and Samuel Schnell, co-partners, doing business under the firm name and style of H. Schnell & Company, Petitioners,
802 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peoples Bank of Keyser, West Virginia, Petitioner,
804 vs.
International Finance Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

The American Tobacco Company,

Petitioner,

812 vs.

Porto Rican American Tobacco Company of Porto Rico.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Public Utility Commissioners of New Jersey, Petitioner,

815 vs.

Plainfield-Union Water Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

The Court will take a recess from today until Monday, May 13; from that day until Monday, May 20; from that day until Monday, May 27; and from that day until Monday, June 3, upon which day it will adjourn for the term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. H. Bull Steamship Company, as owner of the Steamship "Margaret", Petitioner,
803 vs.
J. H. Hudson, Master and Bailee of the British Steamship "Manchester Merchant", etc.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for respondent to defer the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until respondent has had time to file a cross-petition, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with direction to file the cross-petition and all briefs thereon for submission on May 13th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Commerce Commission, Petitioner,
782 vs.
United States of America, at the Relation of City of Los Angeles.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the considerationof the Court by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the petitioner.

W. E. Richardson et al., Petitioners,
854 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to print the record in this case at public expense was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. Sargent for the petitioners.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, Appellant,
792 vs.
Harold E. West, Chairman, et al.

The motionto advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Markell for the appellant.

The United States of America on the relation of John Munsill Ulrich, Petitioner, 858 vs. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States, et al.	On motion of Mr. Joseph Koletsky for the petitioner, Henry L. Stimson, present Secretary of State was substituted as a party respondent in this case is place of Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, resigned.
The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, Appellant, 792 vs. Harold E. West, Chairman, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles McHenry Howard, Mr. Charles Markell, and Mr. Henry H. Waters for the appellant.
The Railroad Commission of the State of California and The City of Los Angeles, Appellants, 801 vs. Los Angeles Railway Corporation.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur T. George for the appellants.
W. O. Booher, Plaintiff in error, 721 vs. The State of Washington.	The return of the plaintiff in error to the rule to show cause was presented to the consideration of the Court.
Advance Automobile Accessories, Petitioner, 773 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Wilmeth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the respondent.

Henry C. Cutting,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
Mahlon P. Bryan, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Peter F. Dunne for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. McNab for the respondents.

Globe Indemnity Company,
Petitioner,
800 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur H. Stetson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder and Mr. Eugene Underwood for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
806 vs.
Blue Ridge Power Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. L. Bomar and Mr. C. W. Tillett for the respondent.

E. Franklin Brewster,
Petitioner,
807 vs.
Bert P. Gage, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gurdon W. Fitch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the respondent.

Clarence M. Woolley and Rolland J. Hamilton, etc., Petitioners,
808 vs.
John F. Malley, former Collector of Internal Revenue;
Clarence M. Woolley and Rolland J. Hamilton, etc., Petitioners,
809 vs.
John F. Malley, former Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry LeBaron Sampson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Barham R. Cary for the respondent.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior,
Petitioner,
813 vs.
United States on relation of Emil L. Krushnic.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. E. C. Finney, and Mr. Randolph S. Collins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. Langdon H. Larwill, Mr. George K. Thomas, and Mr. Peter Q. Nyce for the respondent.

Red Wing Linseed Company,
Petitioner,
817 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond S. Pruitt, Mr. Oswald D. Luby, and Mr. John J. Grealis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Harvey R. Gamble, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Shelby S. Faulkner for the respondent.

Tootal Broadhurst Lee Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
818 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Morse Hubbard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Arthur George Hurst, Petitioner,
819 vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Hott and Mr. Stephen M. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Jesse W. Clarke, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
847 vs.
The Haberle Crystal Springs Brewing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harvey R. Gamble for the petitioner.

MONDAY, MAY 13, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard T. Jones, It is ordered that Daniel M. Garrahan, Esquire, of Allentown, State of Pennsylvania; Edward J. Garrahan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia; and Thomas F. Garrahan, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Niess, It is ordered that Edwin Mark Niess, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Thomas Taylor, It is ordered that Ferre C. Watkins, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Butte, It is ordered that Lewis Horatio Barnes, Esquire, of Elgin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Quirk, It is ordered that Harry S. Elkins and William B. Wilbur, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., It is ordered that Clark H. Hebner, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman, It is ordered that Joseph W. Bailey, Jr., Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, It is ordered that John Henry McEvers, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Goodwin, It is ordered that Louis A. Gebhard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that William Cogger, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Samuel B. Kirby, Jr., Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell, It is ordered that Karl H. Kober, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Mauro Baradi, Esquire, of Bani, Pangasinan, Philippine Islands; Apolonio Suntay, Esquire, of Hagonoy, Bulacan, Philippine Islands; Jose A. de Jesus, Esquire, of Bulacan, Bulacan, Philippine Islands; and Jose Yulo, Esquire, of Bago, Occidental Negros, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Howland Chase, 3rd, It is ordered that Charles Dickerman Williams, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Hatch, It is ordered that Logan Hay, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that John Rowe Snively, Esquire, of Rockford, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse P. Crawford, It is ordered that May F. Hogan, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

Central New England Railway Company, Petitioner,
532 vs.
Boston & Albany Railroad Company, Assignor, for the Benefit of New York Central Railroad Company, Assignee.

On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court for the County of Suffolk, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The People of the State of New York, Appellants, vs. Gamble Latrobe, Jr., James P. Knowles, and William S. Erichs, Trustees, etc.

601

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Concurring: Mr. Justice McReynolds, and Mr. Justice Butler.

International Shoe Company, Appellant, vs. Stratton Shartel, Attorney General of the State of Missouri, and C. Eugene Stephens, State Treasurer of the State of Missouri.

579

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America
ex rel. Niels Peter Claussen,
Petitioner,
416 Vs.
Hon. Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner
of Immigration.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States,
Petitioner,
440 vs.
The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Morris & Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
450 vs.
Skandinavia Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and this this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste.
Marie Railway Company,
Petitioner,
454 vs.
John Rock.

On writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois, and/or the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois, and/or to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Appellate Court for the First District, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Ivy L. Leonard and Thomas B. Leonard, Copartners, trading as I. L. Leonard & Company,

Plaintiffs in error and Appellants,

260 vs.

Swepson Earle, Conservation Commissioner of Maryland and Head of the Conservation Department of the State of Maryland.

In error to and appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Charles L. Douglas,

Petitioner,

312 vs.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Chief Justice Taft, Mr. Justice Van Devanter, and Mr. Justice Butler.

Edward Becher,

Petitioner,

559 vs.

Contoure Laboratories, Inc., and Herbert Oppenheimer.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ex Parte: Worcester County National Bank of Worcester,

Appellant,

469.

Appeal from the Probate Court for Worcester County, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Probate Court for Worcester County, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Probate Court for Worcester County in this cause dismissing the petition, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Probate Court for Worcester County, State of Massachusetts, for a proceeding by the petitioner as executor de son tort, and for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

305 vs.

Fruit Growers Express Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged, by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

526 vs.

The John Barth Company and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

W. O. Booher,
Plaintiff in error,
721 vs.
The State of Washington.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Petitioner,
782 vs.
United States of America, at the relation of City of Los Angeles.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 28 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. E. Richardson, R. C. Horne, Jr., and Beulah B. Harvey,
Petitioners,
854 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to print the record in this cause in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

W. E. Richardson, R. C. Horne, Jr., and Beulah B. Harvey, Petitioners,
854 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore,
Appellant,
792 vs.
Harold E. West, Chairman, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 28 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore,
Appellant,
792 vs.
Harold E. West, Chairman, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Railroad Commission of the State of California and The City of Los Angeles, Appellants,
301 vs.
Los Angeles Railway Corporation.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
273 vs.
The United States of America et al.

It is ordered that this case be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument and assigned for Monday, October 21 next. Two hours will be allowed to each side, the argument to be presented by one counsel for the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission jointly, and one counsel for the appellants.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Newell B. Wallace, Petitioner,
261 vs.
Motor Products Corporation, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. R. Wheeler,
Petitioner,
711 vs.
Howard Greene, Receiver of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wisconsin,

Tagg Bros. & Moorhead, et al.,
Appellants,
738 vs.
The United States of America et al.

It is ordered that these cases, heretofore advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 7 next, be, and they are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, October 21 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
455 vs.
Edward H. Johnson.
New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
456 vs.
Myrtle J. Johnson.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the opinion of this Court in the above-entitled cases, announced April 8, 1929, be, and the same is hereby, amended so that the concluding paragraph of page 6 thereof shall read as follows: "These writs of certiorari were granted on a petition signed by counsel for petitioner who did not participate in the trial. It stated that the cases were of importance and were such a departure "from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, as to call for an exercise of this Court's power of supervision." But his argument here was so inadequately prepared and exhibited such lack of familiarity with the record as not to be of assistance to the Court, and in the argument of counsel on both sides, who had participated in the trial below, there was a want of that candor which is essential to the proper and adequate presentation of a cause in this Court. The occasion seems appropriate to remind counsel that the attempted presentation of cases without adequate preparation and with want of fairness and candor discredits the bar and obstructs the administration of justice."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. Franklin Brewster, Petitioner,
807 vs.
Bert P. Gage, Collector of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
813 vs.
United States on relation of Emil L. Krushnic.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jesse W. Clarke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the 21st District of New York, Petitioner,
847 vs.
The Haberle Crystal Springs Brewing Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

B. Geren,
Petitioner,
768 vs.
J. S. Cecil.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Advance Automobile Accessories Corporation, Petitioner,
773 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry C. Cutting,
Petitioner,
783 vs.
Mahlon P. Bryan, substituted for Mahlon R. Bryan and Spencer K. Mulford and All Other Persons Similarly Situated.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Globe Indemnity Company,
Petitioner,
800 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
806 vs.
Blue Ridge Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clarence M. Woolley and Rolland J. Hamilton, as surviving executors of the will of John B. Pierce,
Petitioners,
808 vs.
John F. Malley, former Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

Clarence M. Woolley and Rollam J. Hamilton, as surviving executors of the will of John B. Pierce, Petitioners,
809 vs.
John F. Malley, former Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Red Wing Linseed Company, Petitioner,
817 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tootal Broadhurst Lee Company, Ltd., Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

818

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur George Hurst, Petitioner, vs. John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the port of San Francisco, California. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

819

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of New Jersey,
Complainant
——,Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane E. Minard and Mr. Williams A. Stevens for the complainant, and a memorandum on behalf of the State of New York was submitted by Mr. Hamilton Ward and Mr. Albert J. Danaher for the defendant the State of New York.

State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
——, Original vs.
The City of New York.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane E. Minard and Mr. Williams A. Stevens for the complainant, and a memorandum on behalf of the city of New York was submitted by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilley and Mr. J. Joseph Lilly for the defendant.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
State of Indiana et al.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court, per stipulation of counsel, upon the pleadings and briefs including the separate motion of the individual defendants to dismiss the bill of complaint, by Mr. A. Rae Williams on behalf of counsel, with leave to the complainant to file supplemental brief on motion of Mr. Clifford E. Smith in that behalf.

A. H. Bull Steamship Co., etc.,
Petitioner,
803 vs.
J. H. Hudson, Master, etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Paul E. Lesh made to the Court in behalf of Mr. H. Alan Dawson for the respondent, leave was granted to file a brief for the respondent on or before Wednesday next.

Elsinore Perfume Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
821 vs.
Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file an amended petition and brief in this cause and to defer the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas et al.

The motion for an order to make certain parties defendants herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendants, the State of Kansas et al.

Surplus Trading Company,
Plaintiff in error,
33 vs.
J. M. Haynie, as Sheriff and Ex-Officio Collector of Taxes for Pulaski County, Arkansas.

The resignation of J. H. Haynie, as Sheriff and ex-officio collector of taxes for Pulaski County, Arkansas, defendant in error herein, having been suggested, Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Robert F. Cogswell, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error, to substitute R. A. Cook, present sheriff and ex-officio collector of taxes for Pulaski County, Arkansas, as the party defendant in error in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner. 19, Original.

The reply of the petitioner to the returns to the rule, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. B. Crier, Mr. W. E. Kay, and Mr. Robert C. Alston for the petitioner.

Crooker Perry et al., Appellants, 754 vs. Chelan Electric Co. et al.

The return to the rule to show cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Reeves for the appellants.

Samuel W. Green et al., Petitioners, 873 vs. Aetna Life Insurance Company.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Cocke for the petitioners.

Superior Confection Company, Appellant, 746 vs. John B. Craig, Sheriff, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Tolbert for the appellant.

A. R. Kiser, Appellant, 747 vs T. A. Heise, Sheriff, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Tolbert for the appellant.

L. J. Tefft, Appellant, 759 vs. T. T. Grant, as Receiver, et al. etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. J. Tefft pro se.

The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Company of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
743 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. McCarron for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Calloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

A. H. Bull Steamship Company, as owner of the Steamship "Margaret,"
Petitioner,
803 vs.
J. H. Hudson, Master, etc.

J. H. Hudson, Master, etc.,
Petitioner,
892 vs.
A. H. Bull Steamship Company, as owner of the Steamship "Margaret", et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Crandall, Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., and Mr. Joseph W. Henderson for the petitioner in No. 803, and by Mr. H. Alan Dawson for the petitioner in No. 892.

Trent Trust Company, Limited,
Petitioner,
811 vs.
Carl H. W. Isenberg et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar Lawler, Mr. Alfred Sutro, and Mr. Oscar Sutro for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Francis Neylan and Mr. Grove J. Fink for the respondents.

Oregon Exploration Company,
Petitioner,
814 vs.
J. E. Reeves, J. E. Reeves, as Trustee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. D. Leehey for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. [illegible]. Reames for the respondents.

Macondray & Company,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
W. R. Grace & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis T. Hengstler for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Orrick for the respondent.

Austin-Bagley Corporation, Waterloo Distilling Corporation, et al.,
Petitioners,
820 vs.
The United States of America.

Charles H. Fingerhood,
Petitioner,
831 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis Landes for the petitioners in No. 820, by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner in No. 831, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Alfredo Urias,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
The State of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the County Court of El Paso County, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward D. Tittman for the petitioner.

William (Bill) Day,
Petitioner,
823 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will Steel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Gardner P. Lloyd, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the respondent.

Riverside Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
824 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John W. Townsend for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assitant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Frank K. Dyar for the respondent.

Cornelius Anderson, suing on behalf of himself and all other seamen, etc.,
Petitioner,
825 vs.
Shipowner's Association of the Pacific Coast et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herman Phleger and Mr. Maurice E. Harrison for the respondents.

Kehota Mining Company,
Petitioner,
827 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.
Kehota Mining Company,
Petitioner,
828 vs.
C. G. Lewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin W. Smith, Mr. William A. Seifert, and Mr. Maynard Teall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt

Pere Marquette Railway Company, Petitioner,
829 vs.
Joseph N. Russell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Shields, Mr. George W. Meadock, Mr. John Vincent Meadock, Mr. Jerome Meadock, and Mr. Arthur Meadock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Miles J. Purcell for the respondent.

Reuben M. Ellerd, Petitioner,
830 vs.
Hattie C. Griffith et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reuben M. Ellerd, pro se.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,
832 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leo Oppenheimer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Morton P. Fisher for the respondent.

Henri Picard, Max L. Gerard, et al., etc., Petitioners,
833 vs.
The Steamship "Caledonier," her engines, etc., et al.
Jonas & Naumburg, Inc., Petitioner
834 vs.
The Steamship "Caledonier," her engines, etc., et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore L. Bailey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the respondents.

Thomas J. O'Neill,
Petitioner,
836 vs.
Catherine Gray, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Lewis and Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the petitioner, and by Catherine Gray, pro se.

Charles Hass,
Petitioner,
837 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hennessy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Frank S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Mrs. Annie de Graffenreid,
Petitioner,
838 vs.
Yount-Lee Oil Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. H. Ward for the petitioner.

Estate of John W. Billwiller,
by Charles J. Billwiller, Resident Agent,
Petitioner,
840 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry J. Richardson and Mr. L. L. Hamby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. John Vaughan Groner for the respondent.

Mary Hudson, as Administratrix of the Estate of John Hudson, deceased,
Petitioner,
842 vs.
Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Randolph C. Bias for the petitioner.

M. F. Tillitson, doing business as the Tillitson Specialty Company, Petitioner,
844 vs.
William A. Smith, as Attorney General of the State of Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hal M. Black for the petitioner, and by Mr. William A. Smith and Mr. Roland Boynton for the respondent.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
846 vs.
American Code Company, Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. P. S. Crewe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarke H. Hebner for the respondent.

American Glycerin Company, Petitioner,
848 vs.
D. W. Burleson and James W. McCamey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Tom King for the petitioner.

Minerals Separation North American Corporation, Petitioner,
851 vs.
Magma Copper Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry D. Williams, Mr. William Houston Kenyon, Mr. Lindley M. Garrison, and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Davis and Mr. Merton W. Sage for the respondent.

Elmer Gibson,
Petitioner,
852 vs.
The United States of America.
Oswald A. (Red) Brower, Carl Adams,
et al., Petitioners,
859 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson T. Hattson, Mr. Edmund L. Jones, and Mr. Maurice A. Langhorne for the petitioner in No. 852; by Mr. Rufus W. Pearson for the petitioners, in No. 859; and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the respondent.

Commonwealth of Virginia,
Petitioner,
871 vs.
Marshall & Illsley Bank, executor
of the estate of Arthur H. Fleet,
deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry R. Miller Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Vaughan Gary for the respondent.

William J. Larkin and Henry Larkin
Petitioners,
872 vs.
Washington Loan & Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Sleman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Arthur Peter, Mr. John J. Hamilton, Mr. Frank S. Bright, and Mr. R. Preston Shealey for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MAY 20, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George J. Feldman, It is ordered that Herman J. Witte, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene G. Mason, It is ordered that Herbert C. Kimball, Esquire, of Claremont, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Kearns, It is ordered that S. Anselm Skelton and Calvin Clarke, Esquires, of Portsmouth State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that John Marshall Littlepage, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith, It is ordered that Frank S. Easby-Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley D. Willis, It is ordered that James B. Salem, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Farnum, It is ordered that Sadie Lipner Shulman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence A. Miller, It is ordered that Willard Carlson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky,

Petitioner,

481 vs.

Kate Halloway Alexander et al., Executors of the Estate of A. J. A. Alexander.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United

Standard Oil Company and Sinclair Refining Company, Petitioners,
545 vs.
City of Marysville, L. N. Cole, as Mayor: R. E. Long, et al., etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

W. A. Marshall & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
272 vs.
Steamship "President Arthur"., Her Engines, Boilers, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
California Cooperative Canneries.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Appellant,
568 vs.
Alabama Public Service Commission, Hugh White, H. F. Lee, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated with costs, and the restraining order continued in force; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company and Manufacturers' Railway Company, Appellants, vs. The United States of America and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

131

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission annulled; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Butler, took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. The St. Louis and O'Fallon Railway Company and Manufacturers' Railway Company.

132

Cross appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cross appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Ex Parte: In the Matter of
The Bakelite Corporation,
17 Original. Petitioner.

On petition for writ of prohibition and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

On consideration of the petition for writ of prohibition herein, the return to the rule to show cause, and argument of counsel thereupon had.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be discharged, and that the petition for writ of prohibition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
513 vs.
American Livestock Commission Company; Lewis Barefoot, Trading and Doing Business as the Barefoot Commission Company; Cassidy Southwestern Commission Company et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

International Shoe Company,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted. The order heretofore issued denying the petition for a writ of certiorari is revoked, and the writ is ordered to issue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Shoe Company,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas and The Finney County Water Users' Association,

On consideration of the motion of defendants to make the Graham Ditch Company; The Fort Bent Ditch Company, and others, citizens and residents of the State of Colorado, parties defendants in this cause, It is now hereby ordered, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, and James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, et al.

On consideration of the motion to submit upon the pleadings and upon the motion to dismiss, pursuant to a stipulation, It is now here ordered, that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, and James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that further consideration of the motion of James Duane Duncan, et al., individual defendants in this cause, to dismiss the bill of complaint be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits, and the case is assigned for oral argument on Monday, October 28 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner.
19 Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, and of the returns to the rule to show cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute, and that the writ of mandamus as prayed for, be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
——, Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, May 27, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, May 27, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Crooker Perry and Leonore Perry, his wife, Appellants,
754 vs.
Chelan Electric Company and Chelan County, Washington.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and rule to show cause thereupon issued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on the return to the rule to show cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel W. Green and Ola B. Green,
Petitioners,
873 vs.
Aetna Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel W. Green and Ola B. Green,
Petitioners,
873 vs.
Aetna Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

L. J. Tefft,
Appellant,
759 vs.
T. T. Grant, as Receiver; R. W. Elsom, H. L. Stewart; et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Superior Confection Company,
Appellant,
746 vs.
John B. Craig, Sheriff of Pickens County; Chief of Police of the City of Pickens, et al.

On consideration of the motion for a rule to show cause to issue to Hon. John G. Richards, Governor of the State of South Carolina, why he should not be held in contempt of court for violating the order of supersedeas, and for enforcement of the order of supersedeas, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Superior Confection Company,

Appellant,

746 vs

John B. Craig, Sheriff of Pickens County; Chief of Police of the City of Pickens; Chief of Police of the City of Easley; et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Superior Confection Company,

Petitioner,

746 vs.

John B. Craig, Sheriff of Pickens County, Chief of Police of the City of Pickens, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Stateof South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. R. Kiser,

Appellant,

747 vs.

T. A. Heise, Sheriff of Richland County, John W. Richardson, Chief Constable, et al.

On consideration of the motion for a rule to show cause to issue to Hon. John G. Richards, Governor of the State of South Carolina, why he should not be held in contempt of court for violating the order of supersedeas, and for enforcement of the order of supersedeas, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. R. Kiser,

Appellant,

747 vs.

T. A. Heise, Sheriff of Richland County, John W. Richardson, Chief Constable, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. R. Kiser,

Petitioner,

747 vs.

T. A. Heise, Sheriff of Richland County, John W. Richardson, Chief Constable, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
846 vs.
American Code Company, Incorporated.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minerals Separation North American Corporation, Petitioner,
851 vs.
Magma Copper Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Company of Pennsylvania, Petitioner,
743 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. H. Bull Steamship Company, as owner of the Steamship "Margaret," Petitioner,

803 vs.

J. H. Hudson, Master and Bailee of the British Steamship "Manchester Merchant" etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. H. Hudson, Master and Claimant of the British Steamship "Manchester Merchant," Petitioners,

892 vs.

A. H. Bull Steamship Company, Owner and Claimant of the American Steamship "Margaret" et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Trent Trust Company, Limited,

Petitioner,

811 vs.

Carl H. W. Isenberg, Hans O. C. Isenberg, Helen Zur Helle, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Oregon Exploration Company,

Petitioner,

814 vs.

J. E. Reeves, J. E. Reeves, as Trustee, Theodore Bernards and Antone Hermans.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Macondray & Company,
Petitioner,
816 vs.
W. R. Grace & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Austin-Bagley Corporation, Waterloo Distilling Corporation, Ludwig Bauer, et al.,, Petitioners,
820 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Fingerhood,
Petitioner,
831 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alfredo Urias,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
The State of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the County Court of El Paso County, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the County Court of El Paso County, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William (Bill) Day,
Petitioner,
823 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the ssame is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Riverside Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
824 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cornelius Anderson, suing on behalf of himself, and all other seamen, etc., Petitioner,
825 vs.
Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kehota Mining Company, Petitioner,
827 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kehota Mining Company,

Petitioner,

828 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pere Marquette Railway Company,

Petitioner,

829 vs.

Joseph N. Russell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reuben M. Ellerd,

Petitioner,

830 vs.

Hattie C. Griffith, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Surety Company of New York,

Petitioner,

832 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henri Picard, Max L. Gerard and Victor Mertens, copartners doing business under the firm name & style of H. Picard & Co.,

Petitioners,

833 vs.

The Steamship "Caledonier," her engines, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jonas & Naumburg, Inc.,

Petitioner,

834 vs.

The Steamship "Caledonier", her engines, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas J. O'Neill,

Petitioner,

836 vs.

Catherine Gray, as Administratrix of the Goods, chattels and credits which were of Edward Gray, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Hass,

Petitioner,

837 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Annie de Graffenreid,
Petitioner,
838 vs.
Yount-Lee Oil Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Estate of John W. Billwiller, by Charles J. Billwiller, Resident Agent,
Petitioner,
840 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary Hudson, as Administratrix of the estate of John Hudson, deceased,
Petitioner,
842 vs.
Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

M. F. Tillitson, doing business as
the Tillitson Specialty Company,
Petitioner,
844 vs.
William A. Smith, as Attorney General
of the State of Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Glycerin Company,
Petitioner,
848 vs.
D. W. Durleson and James W. McCamey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elmer Gibson,
Petitioner,
852 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Oswald A. (Red) Brower, Carl Adams, Art Kendall, et al.,
Petitioners,
859 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Virginia,
Petitioner,
871 vs.
Marshall & Illsley Bank, executor of the estate of Arthur H. Fleet, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William J. Larkin and Henry Larkin, Petitioners,
872 vs.
Washington Loan and Trust Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Appellant,
845 vs.
Harry M. Wurzbach.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed, and statement as to jurisdiction, beyond the time prescribed in Rules 12 and 13, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte: In the matter of Leroy B. Delaney. Petitioner.
———.

The motion for leave to file a petition of Arthur O. Fording for rules to show cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in that behalf.

Rose Harlow et al., Petitioners,
887 vs.
Gladys E. Cowles Harlow.

The motion for substitution of the parties in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond B. Dickey in behalf of counsel for the petitioners.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
806 vs.
Blue Ridge Power Co.

The motion for stay of proceedings pending the filing and determination of a petition for rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney R. Prince for the petitioner.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works and Director of the Department of Highways and Public Works of the State of Ohio, et al., Appellants,
674 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Co.
Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works and Director of the Department of Highways and Public Works of the State of Ohio, et al., Appellants,
675 vs.
The Providence Mill Company.

The motion to amend the answer in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gilbert Bettman for the appellants.

State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas et al.

The motion and stipulation for the appointment of a stenographic commissioner was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendants.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
874 vs.
G. I. Crail, doing business as P. McCoy Fuel Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John Spalding Flannery in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the New York, Chicago, & St. Louis Railroad Company et al., as amicus curiae in this case.

G. M. Adler,
Appellant,
839 vs.
Carlos A. Rector, Sheriff of Greenville County, South Carolina, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant has failed to file the statement as to jurisdiction as required by the Rules of this Court:

Therefore, in pursuance of the Twelfth Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Karl Buzynski,
Petitioner,
905 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Price for the petitioner.

G. Ward Kemp,
Appellant and Plaintiff in Error,
791 vs.
City of Seattle.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Ward Kemp, pro se., in support thereof, and by Mr. Thomas J. L. Kennedy and Mr. J. Ambler Newton for the appellee and defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Baizley Iron Works et al.,
Appellants,
810 vs.
Abraham Span.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Owen J. Robert for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. William J. Conlen for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Harold E. West, Chairman, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
826 vs.
The United Railways and Electric Co. of Baltimore.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond S. Williams and Mr. Thomas J. Tingley for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Charles McHenry Howard, Mr. Charles Markell, and Mr. Henry H. Waters for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

The Iowa Motor Vehicle Association, et al.,
Appellants,
841 vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Iowa et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Casper Schenk for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. John Fletcher, Mr. Maxwell O'Brien, Mr. J. H. Henderson, and Mr. Stephen Robinson for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

The James Clark Distilling Company of Cumberland, Maryland, etc., Petitioners,
805 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Markell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assstant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Frank K. Dyar for the respondent.

Harold E. West, Chairman, and J. Frank Harper, et al., etc., Petitioners,
826 vs.
The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond S. Williams and Mr. Thomas J. Tingley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles McHenry Howard, Mr. Charles Markell, and Mr. Henry H. Waters for the respondent.

Lolita Holding Company, Petitioner,
835 vs.
Aronson & Company, Newberger, Parsons & Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will R. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jefferson P. Chandler for the respondent.

Fred I. King, Petitioner,
850 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Frank S. Ridgely for the

Mrs. Theodosia S. Smith,
Petitioner,
853 vs.
Mutual Life Insurance Company of
New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph D. Barksdale, Mr. Albert H. Van Hook, and Mr. Howard B. Warren for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery and Mr. Frederick L. Allen for the respondent.

Cash J. Morrison and Carl L.
Morrison, Petitioners,
855 vs.
Henry Regus, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry P. Dart, Jr., for the petitioners.

Independence Indemnity Company,
Petitioner,
856 vs.
Florence P. Barber, as guardian of
Lucy Barber and Florence Barber,
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Ormonde Hunter for the petitioner.

The United State of America on
the relation of John Munsell
Ulrich, Petitioner,
858 vs.
Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of
State of the United States, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Koletsky for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

John J. McKenna,

Petitioner,

861 vs

Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe for the respondent.

New York Central Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

863 vs.

Antonia Ambrose, as Administratrix of the estate of John Ambrose, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert C. Wall and Mr. John A. Hartpence for the petitioner. and by Mr. Alexander Simpson for the respondent.

Sol Jacobs,

Petitioner,

866 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis Landes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Illinois Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
874 vs.
G. I. Crail, doing business as P. McCoy Fuel Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward C. Craig, Mr. Edwin C. Brown, and Mr. R. V. Fletcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Stanley B. Houck for the respondent.

Rose Harlow, Lillian Harlow Green, et al., Petitioners,
887 vs.
Gladys E. Cowles Harlow.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Barbour and Mr. Leo P. Harlow for the petitioners, and by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright and Mr. Raymond B. Dickey for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, May 27, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley , Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Lobingier, It is ordered that Rollin Howard Transue, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Loyd H. Sutton, It is ordered that Clinton S. Janes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Harry E. Ryan, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dill, It is ordered that John C. Bowen, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude P. Porter, It is ordered that Clyde B. Charlton and Carson L. Taylor, Esquires, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duane E. Minard, It is ordered that William A. Stevens, Esquire, of Long Branch, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, It is ordered that Wm. C. Mayer, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York; Thomas W. A. Crowe, Frank T. Fitzgerald, Edward F. Joyce, Jr., and Frank J. Coyle, Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Wright Patman, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that J. A. Jones, Esquire, of Kinston, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Edward T. Lasear, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis T. S. Oliver, Jr., It is ordered that Curley C. Hoffmeir, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Herold D. Ruel, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Rowland Chase III, It is ordered that Charles W. McClumpha, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Alpheus H. Favour, Esquire, of Prescott, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Gulf Refining Company,

Petitioner,

506 vs.

Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Okanogan, Methow, San Poelis (or San Poil), Nespelem, Colville, and Lake Indian Tribes or Bands of the State of Washington,

Petitioners,

565 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

White River Lumber Company,

Plaintiff in error,

101 vs.

The State of Arkansas ex rel. H. W. Applegate, Attorney General.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Dissenting: Mr. Chief Justice Taft, Mr. Justice Van Devanter, and Mr. Justice Butler.

Western and Atlantic Railroad

Appellant,

519 vs.

Mrs. Mary E. Henderson and Maryland Casualty Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

484 vs.

Rosika Schwimmer.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the decree of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Sanford.

David S. Barry, Sergeant-at-Arms of the U. S. Senate, and John J. McGrain, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

647 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Macallen Company, Appellant, vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

578 — Appeal from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Wheeler Lumber Bridge and Supply Company of Des Moines, Iowa,
571 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the certificate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Indian Motocycle Company,
576 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the certificate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
133 vs.
Tobe Stapleton, by his Statutory Guardian, Marion Stapleton.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky for

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
806 vs.
Blue Ridge Power Company.

On consideration of the motion for stay of proceedings in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina pending the action of this Court on a petition for rehearing filed in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rose Harlow, Lillian Harlow Green, et al., Petitioners,
887 vs.
Gladys E. Cowles Harlow.

The death of Rose Harlow, one of the petitioners in this cause, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion to substitute George A. Harlow, executor of the estate of Rose Harlow, deceased, as a party petitioner in this cause; It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rose Harlow, Lillian Harlow Green, et al., Petitioners,
887 vs.
Gladys E. Cowles Harlow.

The death of Gladys E. Cowles Harlow, respondent herein, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion to substitute Carrie V. Cowles, administratrix of the estate of Gladys E. Cowles Harlow, deceased, as the party respondent in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent etc., et al., Appellants, 674 vs. The Maumee Valley Electric Company.

On consideration of the motion to amend the answer of the Superintendent of Public Works and Director of Highways and Public Works of the State of Ohio in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent etc., et al., Appellants, 675 vs. The Providence Mill Company.

On consideration of the motion to amend the answer of the Superintendent of Public Works and Director of Highways and Public Works of the State of Ohio in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado, Complainant, 14, Original. vs. The State of Kansas, et al.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of Millen S. Atwood, of Trinidad, Colorado, pursuant to a stipulation of the parties, to serve as the stenographic commissioner in this case, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Karl Buzynski,
Petitioner,
905 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., and The Texas Contracting Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Karl Buzynski,
Petitioner,
905 vs.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Inc., and The Texas Contracting Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. Ward Kemp,
Appellant and Plaintiff in Error,
791 vs.
The City of Seattle.

Appeal from and in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error and appeal in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. Ward Kemp,
Petitioner,
791 vs.
The City of Seattle.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Baizley Iron Works et al.,
Appellants,
810 vs.
Abraham Span.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Iowa Motor Vehicle Association et al., Appellants,
841 vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Iowa et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harold E. West, Chairman, et al.,
Appellants,
826 vs.
The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.

It is now here ordered that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction and the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be postponed to the hearing of the case on its merits. The case is advanced and assigned for argument with No. 792 heretofore assigned for Monday, October 28th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred I. King,
Petitioner,
850 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ; and that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
863 vs.
Antonia Ambrose, as Administratrix of the Estate of John Ambrose, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
874 vs.
C. I. Crail, doing business as P. McCoy Fuel Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The James Clark Distilling
Company of Cumberland, Maryland,
for the use of James Clark and
Safe Deposit & Trust Company of
Baltimore, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,

805 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lolita Holding Company,
Petitioner,

835 vs.

Aronson & Company, Newberger,
Parsons & Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Theodosia S. Smith,
Petitioner,
853 vs.
Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cash J. Morrison and Carl L. Morrison, Petitioners,
855 vs.
Henry Regus, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Independence Indemnity Company,
Petitioner,
856 vs.
Florence P. Barber, as guardian of Lucy Barber and Florence Barber, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America on the relation of John Munsill Ulrich, Petitioner,
858 vs.
Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State of the United States, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John J. McKenna, Petitioner,
861 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the Third District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sol Jacobs, Petitioner,
866 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George A. Harlow, executor of the estate of Rose Harlow, deceased, Lillian Harlow Green, George A. Harlow, and Mary V. Harlow, Petitioners,
387 vs.
Carrie V. Cowles, Administratrix of the Estate of Gladys E. C. Harlow, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Trent Trust Company, Limited, Petitioner,
811 vs.
Carl H. W. Isenberg, Hans O. C. Isenberg, et al.

On consideration of the motion for stay of proceedings and direction to the lower court to withhold action until Monday, June 3 next, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fayette Bank & Trust Company, et al., Petitioners,
904 vs.
William P. Herod et al.

On consideration of the motion of the petitioners to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari as to Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York, one of the respondents in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original vs.
The State of Kansas et al.

The motion of the defendant, Finney County Water Users Association, for leave to amend its answer was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long in that behalf.

State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas et al.

The motion of the complainant for leave to plead to the answer of the State of Kansas on or before July 1 next was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long in behalf of counsel for the complainant.

Federal Sugar Refining Company,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case to be heard following cases Nos. 220 and 676 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wade H. Ellis in behalf of Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner.

Sidney Brunn,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
The State of Washington.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing beyond the time specified in Rule 33, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
——, Original. vs.
The State of Delaware.

The motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the complainant.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant, 20, Original vs. The State of New York and The City of New York.	The motion for leave to file answer and for leave to withdraw and amend answer was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly for the defendant, The City of New York.
The State of New Jersey, Complainant, 21, Original. vs. The City of New York.	The motion for leave to answer and for enlargement of time of two weeks from this date within which to answer was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly for the defendant.
State of New Jersey, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of New York and The City of New York.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the defendant, The State of New York, leave was granted to file answer of the State of New York.
Ex Parte: In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Kansas et al., ——, Original. Petitioners.	The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and for a rule to show cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Egan for the petitioners.
The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 6, Original. vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States of America, Intervenor.	The motion of the defendant herein for the direction to the clerk to make a refund of overpayment made by the State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom Connally in behalf of Mr. Claude Pollard for the defendant.

John A. McKay,
Appellant,
322 vs.
Hector McInnes et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing beyond the time specified in Rule 33, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
884 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, etc., et al.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record and a motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander M. Bull and Mr. Sidney F. Andrews for the respondents in support thereof, and by Mr. Brenton K. Fisk and Mr. Harry S. Elkins for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

The Report of the Clerk of action under the order of this Court of October 15, 1928 was presented, and is in the following words and figures viz:

"To the Honorable,

The Supreme Court of the United States:

Report of the Clerk of Action under the Court's order of October 15, 1928.

Pursuant to paragraph numbered 2 of the order of this Court, of October 15, 1928, further report is respectfully submitted with respect to two items of monies, therein mentioned, held in the custody of the Clerk, pursuant to the said order, in the cases of No. 11, Original, of the October Term, 1905, State of Louisiana vs. State of Mississippi, ($381.80), and No. 4, Original of the October Term, 1916, State of North Carolina vs. State of Tennessee, ($2612.26).

As directed by the said order, efforts have been made to settle the two cases above referred to, through correspondence with appropriate officers of the respective States.

In the case of No. 11, Original, October Term, 1905, State of Louisiana vs. State of Mississippi, I am informed by the Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, in his most recent communication on this subject under date of May 17th, 1929, that the State is at present without funds from which payment can be made of the amount of costs due from it ($5694.70), and that an appropriation by the Legislature will be necessary before the amount can be paid. The Attorney General states that the Legislature of Mississippi will convene in January, 1930, at which time a bill will be submitted to the appropriations committee, accompanied by his request that it be passed.

In the case of No. 4, Original, October Term, 1916, State of North Carolina vs. State of Tennessee, correspondence with the Attorney General of Tennessee was referred by him to the Comptroller of the Treasury of that State, from which it would appear that that State is considering payment of the costs($3,428.97) due from it in this case. The last letter from the Comptroller is dated March 4, 1929.

By way of explanation, it may be said that the death of a former Attorney General of the State of Tennessee, familiar with this case, and subsequent changes in that office, with apparent loss of records, caused the Comptroller of the Treasury to request information and data before he could proceed. Such information and data were furnished to him on March 21st, 1929.

It is the failure of the two States, Mississippi and Tennessee, to pay the costs mentioned, which delays the settlement of these cases. The efforts made to collect the amounts due show progress, and indicate the probability of satisfactory settlement if the Court will authorize the Clerk to retain the two items of monies specified in the order of October 15, and give an extension of time to permit the States of Mississippi and Tennessee to pay the costs due by them respectively, and thus enable the Clerk to make a refund of the amounts held by him. It is therefore recommended that the Court order a further extension of time, with consequent opportunity for settlement."

(Signed) CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY

CLERK."

Barbara J. Jumer,
Appellant,
931 vs.
Del Cary Smith et al.

The motion by the appellant for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Barbara J. Jumer pro se.

James Horace Alderman,
Petitioner,
935 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion by the petitioner for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. M. Carr for the petitioner.

First Addition to the Rattle Snake Drainage District et al.,
Appellants,
797 vs.
Walter Bodeman et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. L. Butler, Mr. R. M. Risser, Mr. Frank Lucas, and Mr. C. E. Buell for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. William R. Bagley, for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Elsinore Perfume Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
821 vs.
Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator for the Second District of New York, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis Landes and Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Alfred A. Wheat for the respondent.

Max Levy & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
Frank Kartz, doing business as Illinois Cullet Company, Not Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the First District, State of Illinois, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Vernon E. West and Mr. Ephraim Banning for the respondent.

Pelican Bay Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
862 vs.
David M. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. T. C. Gregory for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Alfred A. Wh at, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Miller W. McGilchrist for the respondent.

John Parrot, Jr., and Mary Emilie Parrott Williams, as executor and executrix, respectively, of the estate of Mary Emilie Parrott, deceased, Petitioners,
864 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Eldred Boland for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Whout, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

David Fahey, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
865 vs.
John Sapio, A. Capaldo, and G. Mancuso.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Anderson and Mr. Mart H. Royston for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. T. Armstrong for the respondent.

Henry A. Cornish and Alyce N. Cornish, Petitioners,
867 vs.
Patrick O'Donoghue, Hugh A. Morrison, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. William E. Leahy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, and Mr. Lucien H. Mercier for the respondents.

Edward C. Russell, Susie B. Russell, et al., Petitioners,
868 vs.
Frank S. Wallace, Francis J. P. Cleary, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. William E. Leahy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, and Mr. Lucien H. Mercier for the respondents.

Conklin, Zonne, Loomis Company, Petitioner,
870 vs.
David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Faegre for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr.

Harley & Lund Corporation,
Petitioner,
876 vs.
Murray Rubber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Unger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Kelly Prentice for the respondent.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
877 vs.
United States of America ex rel. Mary I. Kadrie et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by MR. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Seth W. Richardson, Mr. E. C. Finney, and Mr. Pedro Capo-Rodriguez for the petitioner, and by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the respondents.

Harry C. Moore, as Treasurer of Grant County, Indiana,
Petitioner,
879 vs.
Sidney Z. Mitchell and Miel A. Weathers, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell H. Robbins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Graham Sumner for the respondents.

George D. Haskell,
Petitioner,
881 vs.
William R. Perkins, Nanaline H. Duke, et al.

George D. Haskell,
Petitioner,
882 vs.
William R. Perkins, Nanaline H. Duke, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. McCarter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. George W. Schurman, Mr. Forrest Hyde, and Mr. Philip M. Payne for the respondents.

Samuel L. White,
Petitioner,
883 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel L. White, pro se, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
884 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brenton K. Fisk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander M. Bull and Mr. Sidney F. Andrews for the respondents.

Neuss, Hesslein & Co., Inc., Petitioner,
888 vs.
William H. Edwards, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard S. Holmes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

George E. Farrington, E. Standwood Hollis, et al., Petitioner,
898 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marvin Farrington for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the respondent.

Morris Lisansky and David Lisansky, Petitioners,
899 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Isaac Lobe Straus for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. John Vaughan Groner for the respondent.

The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.,
The B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co.,
et al., Petitioners,
902 vs.
Fayette Bank & Trust Co., Central
State Bank of Connersville,
Indiana, et al.
The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.,
The B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co.,
et al., Petitioners,
903 vs.
Fayette Bank & Trust Co., Central
State Bank of Connersville, Indiana,
et al.
Fayette Bank & Trust Company,
Central State Bank of Connersville,
Indiana, et al., Petitioners,
904 vs.
William P. Herod, United States of
America, et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey J. Elam, Mr. Howard S. Young, and Mr. Willis Bacon for the petitioners, in Nos. 902 and 903; by Mr. George L. Wire and Mr. Solon J. Carter for the petitioners in No. 904; and by Mr. George L. Wire and Mr. Solon J. Carter for the respondents in Nos. 902 and 903; and by Mr. William P. Herod, Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. John Vaughan Groner for the respondents in No. 904.

Simms Oil Company,
Petitioner,
910 vs.
Eudora S. Day, Sheriff and ex officio
Tax Collector.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. L. Herold for the petitioner.

Feeders' Supply Company,
Petitioner,
912 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Arthur W. Henderson for the respondent.

Orient Point Wharf Company and Edwin H. King, Petitioners,
918 vs.
Machias Lumber Company, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward Ash for the respondents.

Southern Trust Company,
Petitioner,
926 vs.
W. C. Austin and Samuel E. Swinney, Receivers, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kent V. Cay and Mr. William E. Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Stanley Boykin and Mr. H. C. Ray for the respondents.

Simone Saitta, doing business under the firm name and style of Saitta & Jones, Petitioner,
929 vs.
S. S. "Florinda" and John Simon Caray.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Joffe for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. DeGrove Potter for the respondents.

Atlantic Gulf and West Indies Steamship Lines, Claimant of S. S. "Agwimoon," Petitioner,
932 vs.
Interocean Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper and Mr. Frederic Conger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Stuart S. Janney and Mr. Robert W. Williams for the respondent.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
934 vs.
R. L. Bryant, Administrator of the Estate of M. L. Bryant, deceased.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Perry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Curry for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Edward T. Sanford,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley B. Houck, It is ordered that James Morris, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, and John F. Bonner, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that Willard Lanning Hart, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Frederick W. Moore, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude Pollard, It is ordered that Rice M. Tilley, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George J. Feldman, It is ordered that John H. J. Quigley, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. McClintock, It is ordered that M. May Allison, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. Bon Gaulin, It is ordered that Raymond A. Walsh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that A. Longstreet Meiskell, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, It is ordered that Franklin Pierce Matz, Esquire, of Huron, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl R. Chindblom, It is ordered that Jay Arthur Schiller and Samuel P. Gurman, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe C. Patterson, It is ordered that Lawrence H. Presley, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of Missouri, and Rowland L. Johnston, Esquire, of Rolla, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bernard F. Carvey, It is ordered that John A. Manahan, Esquire, of Stratford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that J. Arthur Mattson, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that William C. Lewis, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma; Alvin Moore, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Oklahoma; and William M. Williams, Esquires, of Mangum, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis L. Mohundro, It is ordered that Jesse J. Robinett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Brooks Hays, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Attorney General introduced the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Jr., of New York, Solicitor General of the United States, and it was ordered that his commission be recorded.

"Herbert Hoover,

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:

Know Ye; That reposing special trust and confidence in the Wisdom, Uprightness, and Learning of Charles Evans Hughes, Jr., of New York, I have nominated, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Solicitor General and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfill the duties of that Office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, and to Have and to Hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto Him, the said Charles Evans Hughes, Jr., during the pleasure of the President.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

(SEAL)

Done at the City of Washington this Twenty-seventh day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-third.

By the President

(signed) William D. Mitchell

Attorney General

(signed) Herbert Hoover"

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works and Director of the Department of Highways and Public Works of the State of Ohio, etc., et al., Appellants,
374 vs.
The Maumee Valley Electric Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, but without prejudice to certain rights of the appellee; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Harry J. Kirk, as Superintendent of Public Works and Director of the Department of Highways and Public Works of the State of Ohio, etc., et al., Appellants,
675 vs.
The Providence Mill Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
225 vs.
Marcella Driggers, as Administratrix of William A. Driggers, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
524 vs.
Millie R. Jones.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit with instructions to consider the several assignments of error relating to the rulings of the trial court in the progress of the trial, and --unless they have been waived--take further proceedings in regard thereto.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, William W. Wheelock, and William G. Bierd, Receivers, etc., et al., Appellants,
563 vs.
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and upon a motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the orders of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, and Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Appellants,
466 vs.
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Harry F. Sinclair, Henry Mason Day, William J. Burns, W. Sherman Burns,
748 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate and the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed as to William J. Burns, and affirmed as to the other appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, etc., et al., Petitioners,

vs.

D. W. Michaux, Chester H. Bryan, A. J. Dow, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

No. 7.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Old Colony Trust Company et al., Executors,

vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

No. 130.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America,
129 vs.
Boston & Maine Railroad.

On a certificate from the United States of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
——, Original. vs.
The State of Delaware.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, July 1, 1929.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte; In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Kansas, and William A. Smith, Attorney General of the State of Kansas, Petitioners.
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. And it is further ordered that cause be shown by the Honorable John C. Pollock, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, in printed form, returnable July 1, 1929, why a writ of mandamus should not issue out of this Court requiring him to call to his assistance two other Federal Judges as provided by section 266 of the Judicial Code, as amended, (Title 28, section 380 of the United States Code) to hear

and determine the motion and prayer of the plaintiff for an interlocutory injunction against the defendants in the case of Agricultural Insurance Company, a corporation, plaintiff, vs. Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Kansas, and William A. Smith, Attorney General of the State of Kansas, and in 149 other cases pending in said District Court wherein various other stock fire insurance companies doing business in the State of Kansas have filed bills of complaint against the said Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance, etc., et al., and to hear and determine the issues in, and to render decrees at the final hearing of, each of said cases.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Oklahoma,
Complainant
6 Original vs.
State of Texas,
Defendant,
The United States,
Intervenor.

It appearing to the Court that the costs, and the compensation and expenses allowed to the commissioners, in that part of this cause which related to the boundary between the State of Texas and the State of Oklahoma along the Red River have been fully paid: And it further appearing that the State of Texas advanced and paid more than its proportionate share of such costs, compensation and expenses, and that the excess so advanced and paid is now held by the Clerk pending an order that the same be refunded:

It is considered and ordered by the Court that the Clerk do compute and ascertain the amount so advanced and paid by the State of Texas in excess of its proportionate share of such costs, compensation and expenses, and that he refund and pay such excess to the said State.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original vs.
The State of Kansas and Finney County Water Users Association.

On consideration of the motion for leave to amend the answer of defendant, Finney County Water Users Association, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas and Finney County Water Users Association.

On consideration of the motion of the complainant for leave to reply to the answer of the State of Kansas on or before July 1, 1929, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
20, Original vs.
The State of New York and City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw and amend the answer of the City of New York in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is herey, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
21, Original vs.
City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for an enlargement of time of two weeks from May 27, 1929, within which to file the answer of the City of New York in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Sugar Refining Company,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause to be heard following Nos. 220 and 676, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
884 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General, etc.

On consideration of the suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barbara J. Jumer,
Appellant,
931 vs.
Del Cary Smith, George M. Haegele, as guardian ad litem, and Exchange National Bank of Spokane, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barbara J. Jumer,

Appellant,

931 vs.

Del Cary Smith, George M. Haegele, as guardian ad litem, and Exchange National Bank of Spokane, etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barbara J. Jumer,

Petitioner,

931 vs.

Del Cary Smith, George M. Haegele, as guardian ad litem, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Horace Alderman,

Petitioner,

935 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Horace Alderman,

Petitioner,

935 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First Addition to the Rattle Snake Drainage District, et al.,

Appellants,

797 vs.

Walter Bodeman, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed herein, the Court finds that appellate jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wheeler Lumber Bridge & Supply
Company of Des Moines, Iowa,
571 vs.
The United States of America.

Indian Motocycle Company,
576 vs.
The United States of America.

O R D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, restored to the docket for reconsideration, and that the judgments heretofore entered herein be, and they are hereby, revoked and set aside, and that the opinion announced in these cases on Monday, May 27th last, be, and it is hereby, ordered to be withdrawn.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

The Court has considered the report of the Clerk respecting the action taken by him under the second paragraph of the Court's order of October 15, 1928, relating to the collection and disposal of the costs in the cases of No. 11, Original, of the October Term, 1905, State of Louisiana vs. State of Mississippi; and No. 4, Original, of the October Term, 1916, State of North Carolina vs. State of Tennessee;

And it appearing that reasonable efforts have been made to accomplish the collection and disposal of the costs in these cases and that it is probable that these efforts will be consummated if additional time be granted therefor:

It is considered and ordered by the Court that the Clerk do continue his efforts to collect and dispose of such costs conformably to the second paragraph of the order of October 15, 1928, and that he make a further report during the next term showing what has been done and accomplished in that regard.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
877 vs.
United States of America ex rel. Mary I. Kadrie, Evelina Kadrie, Amit K. Kadrie, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry C. Moore, as Treasurer of Grant, County, Indiana, Petitioner,
879 vs.
Sidney Z. Mitchell and Niel A. Weathers (sued as Niel A. Weathers), as Executors, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
934 vs.
R. L. Bryant, Administrator of the Estate of M. L. Bryant, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elsinore Perfume Co., Inc.,

Petitioner,

821 vs.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator for the Second District of New York, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Max Levy & Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

860 vs.

Frank Hartz, doing business as Illinois Cullet Company, Not Incorporated.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pelican Bay Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

862 vs.

David M. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Parrott, Jr., and Mary Emilie Parrott Williams, as Executor and executrix, respectively of the estate of Mary Emilie Parrott, deceased, Petitioners,

864 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David Fahey, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
865 vs.
John Sapio, A. Capaldo and G. Mancuso.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry A. Cornish, and Alyce M. Cornish, Petitioners,
867 vs.
Patrick O'Donoghue, Hugh A. Morrison, Clara E. Morrison, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edward C. Russell, Susie B. Russell, Edgar T. Newton, Sarah P. Newton and Robert W. Peterson, Petitioners,
868 vs.
Frank S. Wallace, Francis J. P. Cleary, Ann Frances Cleary, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Conklin, Zonne, Loomis Company,

Petitioner,

370 vs.

David H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Marley & Land Corporation,

Petitioner,

378 vs.

Murray Rubber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George D. Markell,

Petitioner,

381 vs.

William R. Perkins, Mathilde W. Duke and George B. Allen, as they are Executors of the estate of the late James B. Duke.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

George D. Haskell,

Petitioner,

882 vs.

William R. Perkins, Manaline H. Duke and George G. Allen, as they are Executors of the estate of the late James B. Duke.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Samuel L. White,

Petitioner,

883 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Krauss Brothers Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

884 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director of Railroads, as Agent under and by virtue of Section 206, Transportation Act of 1920, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Neuss, Hesslein & Co., Inc.,

Petitioner,

888 vs.

William H. Edwards, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George E. Farrington, E. Stanwood Hollis and Edward W. Bancroft, Executors of the Will of Norton Eugene Hollis,

Petitioners,

898 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Morris Lisansky and David Lisansky, Petitioners,
899 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.,
The B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co.,
et al., Petitioners,
902 vs.
Fayette Bank & Trust Co., Central State Bank of Connersville, Indiana, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.,
The B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co.,
et al., Petitioners,
903 vs.
Fayette Bank & Trust Co., Central State Bank of Connersville, Indiana, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fayette Bank & Trust Company,
Central State Bank of Connersville,
Indiana, et al., Petitioners,
904 vs.
William P. Herod, United States of America, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simms Oil Company,
Petitioner,
910 vs.
Eudora S. Day, Sheriff and Ex-officio Tax Collector.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Feeders' Supply Company,
Petitioner,
912 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Orient Point Wharf Company,
and Edwin H. King, Petitioners,
918 vs.
Machias Lumber Company, et al., Owners of the Schooner "Lucy Evelyn."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Trust Company,

Petitioner,

926 vs.

W. C. Austin and Samuel E. Swinney, Receivers of the W. C. Belcher Land Mortgage Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simone Saitta, doing business under the firm name and style of Saitta & Jones,

Petitioner,

929 vs.

S. S. "Florinda" and John Simon Caray.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlantic Gulf and West Indies Steamship Lines, claimant of S. S. "Agwimoon", Petitioner,
932 vs.
Interocean Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Macallen Company, Appellant,
578 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion of Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge in that behalf, leave was granted to file briefs of the State of California and Oregon, as amici curiae in support of a petition for rehearing in this case.

The Macallen Company, Appellant,
578 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion of Mr. Blaine Mallan in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of Washington, as amicus curiae in support of a petition for rehearing in this case.

The United States of America, Appellant,
913 vs.
B. C. Skinner.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss the appeal in this cause has been filed; Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R

It is now here ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket not decided, and all other business of the term not disposed of, be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place